

Radley Neighbourhood Plan Consultation Draft, December 2016

**ANALYSIS OF COMMENTS RECEIVED,
AND RPC'S RESPONSE.**



Respondent <i>Individual respondents are identified by number to provide anonymity</i>	Policy no/ issue	Comment	RPC response
	PP1	PP1. Housing development on the Old Coal Yard site to the west of Thrupp Lane will be supported provided certain conditions are met, especially in relation to traffic and limiting intrusion into Green Belt. The site is currently an eyesore.	
Jonathan Dockar Drysdale and Theresa Colton, owners of Gooseacre Farm		We therefore have no objection in principle to the development of the Old Coal Yard site, but it must be considered in relation to other sites within the NP area. If RPC considers that the special circumstances exist for the removal of the Old Coal Yard from the Green Belt, then those same circumstances must surely apply to Radley South also, where a far more significant contribution to VWHDC's LPPt2 housing requirement (7.6%) can be located.	The old coalyard, unlike the South Radley site, is a small brownfield site
Environment Agency		Our maps indicate that there is currently no main foul sewer close to the Old Coal Yard site. This will need further consideration if the site is brought forward for redevelopment. We are keen to prevent the proliferation of non-mains drainage solutions and would always prefer that such development sites are connected to the main foul sewer network where this is possible. We would strongly recommend that there is a requirement in the Plan that the site developer must liaise with Thames Water to discuss and agree how foul discharges from the site will be managed in the future.	The policy has been amended to reflect this
Historic England		Given these considerations we would expect that, before it is presented for submission to the examiner, the plan will need to be amended to clearly demonstrate that the archaeological interest of the scheduled monument has been understood and the potential impact of the allocation on it and any potential associated remains have been given appropriate consideration. Unfortunately we feel the present policy requirement to protect the monument provides insufficient clarity on the appropriate way forward. As above we would recommend that the policy includes a requirement to undertake investigation of the site's archaeological potential according to a written scheme agreed with the County Archaeologist and that proposals should seek to retain any remains that may be present in-situ. Nevertheless we recognise the importance of providing a clear guide for future use of the site and finding a new use for previously developed land and a derelict site within the green belt. As such, we would welcome further dialogue with the Parish Council concerning this site prior to the preparation of the submission version of the plan. A more positive angle might be to state that proposals that include a conservation management plan that will contribute to the future conservation of the monument and increase public awareness and appreciation of its significance will be supported.	The policy has been amended to reflect this

8		The Old Coal Yard: We disagree with any suggestion that this could be used for housing as this could seem to encourage yet more unwanted development in Radley. It should be returned to a natural habitat so it could become a car park for visitors if Thrupp Lane is closed off near this point.	Noted, but most views support a small development on the site
14		OK	Support noted
17		No comment	
18		Support	
19		Agree	
23		Supported	
25		Agree	
26		I think it all depends on what the development would be like. Needs to be sympathetic, not too extensive, and to contain low cost housing -- NOT more executive homes -- and proper infra-structure, together with wildlife areas, possibly an area of natural vegetation including long grass, which could be a rainfall run-off area.	The proposed policy imposes conditions to ensure the development is suitable
27		I agree with this and if this can be carried out in conjunction with removing the lorries accessing Thrupp Lane, would be a good development.	Support noted. The policy includes conditions on traffic mitigation
29		I support the development on this site. Small sites such as this ought to be given priority over large development sites.	Support noted
30		This brownfield site should be developed before using agricultural land	
31		I object. Too many houses are already proposed to be built.	
32		Support housing development	Support noted
33		Agree, but should go no closer to Audlett Drive than necessary	
35		I agree.	
36		I think traffic is the most important consideration here. Putting more traffic down Thrupp Lane as it exists at the moment is not good idea.	see response to respondent number 27

	PP2 and CA1	PP2 and CA1. Development of the current allotment site by the railway bridge will be supported if it is found to be practicable and if an acceptable alternative allotment site can be found. The Parish Council will develop the site only if there is community benefit. This is a possible site for a bigger community shop (see policies CA2 & CA3).	
Radley Village Shop		The final bullet point on page 16 in Section 4.2.3 states: ‘The Village community shop is given an option to occupy part of the site.’ Without going into detail, we would like it made clear that there are various criteria that would need to be met for the shop to move to the allotment site such as retention of the shop’s community status, suitable pedestrian and vehicle access, and a viable business plan. We would like the wording of the final bullet point of PP.2 changed to: ‘Radley Village Shop is given an option to occupy part of the site, subject to certain criteria being met.’	RPC is 100% supportive of the community shop (Radley Village Shop) and certainly has no plans to offer space to an alternative retail business if the allotment site is developed. Some textual changes have been made to make this intention clearer. Radley Village Shop will be free to set whatever conditions it likes in deciding whether to take up the option proposed.
Radley Village Shop		We would like it made clearer in the Neighbourhood Plan that Radley Parish Council is fully supportive of Radley Village Shop’s community status and has no intention of offering any new shop unit built on the allotment site to a commercial organisation or indeed to a community shop other than Radley Village Shop.	
Radley Village Shop		Community Actions: Implementation Summary. In the final column of the table on page 48, we would like ‘and business’ to be added after ‘economic’ in the entry for CA.1 so that it reads ‘... assessment of economic and business viability, possible ...’ We are not completely sure what the term ‘economic viability’ covers in this context and would like the text amended to make clear that the ability to demonstrate business viability is crucial for the shop’s relocation.	
Jonathan Dockar Drysdale and Theresa Colton, owners of Gooseacre Farm		We totally support the development of the current allotment site as a central hub of the village providing a suitable site for an enlarged community shop to serve the demands of the larger community. The mixed use development of this central allotment area, which is in the ownership of RPC, will generate substantial funds that would be available for RPC to pay for village improvements. For many years our family has made available a section of Gooseacre Farm for use as a football pitch by Radley Youth Football Club. If Radley South is allocated for development in LPPt2, we would be willing to release a much larger section of Gooseacre Farm to accommodate not one but two sports pitches, as well as a replacement and enlarged allotment area, to allow RPC’s central site to be developed. We also own the right of way along the farm track from Gooseacre Farm up to The Bowyers Arms, making this proposed location for these village amenities readily accessible on foot or cycle from the central hub of the village.	Support noted, but the policy does not depend on development of the South Radley site, which the Plan does not support

Environment Agency		<p>We have records that landfilling has probably taken place at the allotment and John Curtis sites within the Plan area – both of which are identified for potential development. Given the age of these sites, if landfilling did take place there is unlikely to be any containment (such as landfill liners), that could be breached by the proposed developments. This reduces our concerns regarding redevelopment of these sites, but there may still be contamination risks associated with redevelopment. Contamination issues from potential landfilling would still need to be resolved as part of any redevelopment. We do not anticipate that contamination issues at these sites would preclude development, but such issues would need to be resolved as part of any redevelopment.</p> <p>Given the above, we would recommend that the following sentence/requirement is included about the three potential development sites at the allotments, the John Curtis site and the Old Coal Yard – if the earlier identified flood risk issues can be overcome: “Appropriate measures will need to be taken to remedy any contamination issues or instability from previous land uses”. We recommend referring to “contamination issues” as it is often not feasible to completely remove all contamination.</p>	Noted
Network Rail		We would appreciate the Council providing Network Rail with an opportunity to comment on any future planning applications should they be submitted for sites adjoining the railway, or within close proximity to the railway as we may have more specific comments to make (further to those above).	Noted
10		I would support a larger village shop, with a post office counter.	Support noted
14		There is the potential to develop this area into a village centre with a shop and green space rather than in-fill housing. But if there is to be in-fill housing this might be suitable area	
15		I believe the area around the pub carpark offers a better solution for a bigger community shop. The car parking for the pub is mainly occupied around the times when the shop is not open, but this would mean having to come to an agreement with the brewery over shared usage. The derelict scrub land currently behind the bus stop could be used for most of the shop development.	Agreed but Greene King are not prepared to pursue this
17		No comment	
18		Support with these provisos	Support noted
23		A bigger community shop is supported	
25		Agree	

26		1. The cost of making enough of a foundation for such a project would make it a bad idea, even on just financial grounds.	It is acknowledged that there are a number of practical problems that would need to be resolved, including ones arising from the levels, but initial studies indicate that this is possible. The aim would be to include communal green space and improve the amenity of those living in the bungalows
		2. Access would be a massive problem, both road and pedestrian:	
		a). The little green outside the bungalows is supposed to be the communal garden for them -- if you visit the bungalows and go out of their kitchens you will see there is but a tiny area for the wheelie bins and a small clothes airer -- and 3 of the properties actually share such a tiny space. The green area must not be compromised, neither do the disabled and elderly residents want their quiet haven to become like Piccadilly Circus, with people -- never mind vehicles -- going past all day. The shrubs on the margin of the grassy area are also home to the birds, which give the elderly people a lot of pleasure, and which would soon depart if their "cover" was taken away.	
		b). The entrance to the little path along the bungalows / grassy area is a very steep slope which is very dangerous in the wet and especially slippery in winter. It is not at all suitable for the residents of Radley to use as they go to the shop.	
		c). People who bought a property in Spinneys Close did so because it was a quiet cul-de-sac. They will not be happy to see the delivery lorries, or even shoppers in cars, going past their windows ever, never mind every day.	
		d). The allotments, being between the railway embankment and the "garden area" mentioned above, are home to a wide variety of wildlife, including hedgehogs (now a threatened species) birds, moths and butterflies -- including the painted lady butterfly which is apparently in decline. Already the long untouched area in Whites Lane, a wild area, is being taken for the housing development, and habitats are being destroyed all around us, so it behoves us to allow the allotment to remain a safe place for nature.	
		e). The allotments are mainly rented by older people who have spent many decades -- and a lot of time and money -- improving their patches and increasing the fertility. In at least 2 cases, the allotment holders have been there since the allotments started up in 1969 -- almost half a century ago. Providing an alternative piece of land is not at all acceptable, since it will not have had that input to make the land suitable. Also, more than half of the allotments have fruit bushes, which take time to mature, and planting a "knitting needle" from the garden centre is not the same as harvesting one's own fruit from mature bushes. One of the allotment holders spent over £100 on soft fruit for his patch only a couple of years ago and those plants were about to become mature. It is not at all fair to take the allotments from people who currently use them. The disappointment and unhappiness such an action would cause to some, if not all, of the allotment holders cannot be over-estimated.	
28		Convenient for the older residents in the bungalows, but they already have the shop across the road and would have to put up with considerable noise and inconvenience while building work is carried out. The level of the area means that the shop would either be at a level below the road or require extensive building work to raise it up. If there is to be parking an exit onto Foxborough Road with other roads joining opposite and from Lower Radley and on a bend is not a good idea. If cars enter from the back it would create a nuisance for the residents.	See response to respondent number 26
29		A larger village shop is an aspiration. The cost of providing such a thing has not been examined. The existing shop was purchased with the help of a grant. This might not be forthcoming for a new premises.	Agreed that sources of finance will need to be considered carefully before this possible project is pursued

30		The allotment holders won't want to move to a new site having spent years tending their plots. As main sewer runs through site and may need further work in future it is not practicable/suitable for new shop	The policy contains provisions to protect the sewer and to provide suitable replacement allotments
31		I object. 1. What other sites are available for allotments? 2. There is already too much development being proposed. What open spaces will be left in Radley?	Views noted, but RPC believe there is merit in exploring the option, including alternative allotment sites which might offer more scope for expansion
32		Support	Support noted
33		Strongly support	
35		I agree.	
36		Finding a site for new larger village shop is very important even if the allotments cannot be developed for whatever reason.	
	PP3	PP3. Inappropriate development outside the built-up area of the village will not be approved except in very special circumstances.	
Jonathan Dockar Drysdale and Theresa Colton, owners of Gooseacre Farm		Radley South has already been identified by VWHDC as suitable for removal from the Green Belt, and it was specifically picked out by the Planning Inspector during the LPPt1 public examination process as being suitable for development. However, he determined at that time that the special circumstances did not exist for its removal from the Green Belt. With VWHDC's acceptance of their 2,200 houses share of Oxford's Unmet Housing Need, to add to the 960 still unallocated in the LPPt1, those special circumstances do now exist. In response to this significant local unmet housing need, the total number of additional homes identified by the NP amounts to some 20 - 25 houses. It appears highly likely that RPC will be required to accommodate a more realistic number of additional homes if VWHDC is to meet the 3,162 target that it has been tasked to allocate in LPPt2. By ignoring this reality, the NP is setting itself up to fail. On the other hand, if it recognises Radley South as the "least worst" option for additional development, it would immediately appear to be a more robust and valid document. It could then argue strongly for the additional Section 106 and CIL funding that would accrue to make possible many of the worthy recommendations set out in the NP. In so doing, it could ensure that Radley remains a desirable location in which to live, with local amenities fit for the 21st Century throughout the life of the Local Plan and beyond.	The Local Plan Part 1 retained the site in the Green Belt and the Vale are not supporting development of the site in their Part 2 proposals. They believe the site is not needed to meet their housing targets. The draft NP text explains that the number of homes in the parish is already set to double, and explains why no further significant housing sites have been identified in the NP.

AWE		<p>The assertion that “this document [the Draft NP] assumes that no additional allocations will be made at Radley” in LP Part 2 seems not to be based on any evidence, or indeed the reality of the situation. Indeed, the timing of publication of the Draft NP just before LP2PA in February 2017 is confusing to the public and maybe seeking to unreasonably influence the content of LP2PA. There is no record of collaboration with VWHDC, or any recognition of housing numbers needing to be allocated, contrary to PPG009 (see above). It would have been preferable to at least await the LP2PA in February to see if any new sites are allocated. Better still (because the ‘preferred approach’ is not the last word on the matter) to have awaited the ‘Pre-Submission’ version in October 2017. Clearly, if no additional sites at Radley are proposed in LP2PA, then AWEL (and perhaps others) will be making (and pursuing) an objection roughly based on the foregoing evidence. If additional sites are proposed for allocation, then the RNP will require a complete overhaul making this Consultation Draft redundant.</p>	See response above
AWE		<p>The paucity of the additional housing provision in the Draft NP has already been covered above - Radley to contribute just 25 additional homes when 3,162 extra homes are required, most if not all, in the Abingdon and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area in which Radley is located. There is no supporting evidence that ‘reasonable alternatives’ have been investigated even if a Sustainability Appraisal/SEA is not required (but see relevant PPG above). However, it would be of interest in understanding the value of the Draft NP to see how the modest housing sites were selected and what other sites were considered</p>	
Barton Willmore		<p>It is advised that if this wording is to remain, in order to be consistent (and in general conformity) with the Local Plan, reference to the development boundary should be removed and the policy should simply relate to proposed development within the Green Belt.</p>	<p>Not sure that this differs from what the Policy currently says. The use of the phrase ‘very special circumstances’ in the context of Green Belt policy is known and understood.</p>

14		Agree. The councillor responsible for housing justified strategic development as a way to prevent ad-hoc development. Any further development would be a betrayal of this justification and be disproportionate in relation to the size of the village.	Support and detailed comments noted
17		Fully support this. It does, however, imply that most of the current proposal should not be approved as building on greenfield sites is inappropriate.	
18		Support with these provisos	
19		Agree	
23		We agree that inappropriate development should not be approved but cannot endorse PP3 because of the lack of clarity as to what constitutes very special circumstances.	
25		Strongly agree	
26		Surely that should be “not approved in ANY circumstances”.	
27		Agreed - It is important that we retain the green space around our village and don't become an extension of other towns	
29		I would be happy to see a sports field or a village hall on the perimeter of the village but not whole scale housing developments which would see the green space between Radley and Kennington and Radley and Abingdon be diminished.	
30		Agree	
31		Central Government, V.W.H.D.C. and Radley College will always find “very special circumstances” to develop further where any scrap of land is available.	
32		Approve	
33		Agree	
35		I agree.	

	PP4	PP4. The mix of tenure and size on the new housing sites should take appropriate account of RPC's evidence of demand from Radley residents and their families.	
Barton Willmore		<p>It should be noted that the allocated sites within Radley are strategic, and therefore aim to meet the identified needs of the Vale of White Horse District as a whole, not simply local needs. On page 17 of the RNP it states that new housing “needs to reflect the needs of those living in Radley and their families” (our emphasis). As discussed above, this is not appropriate given the strategic nature of the sites. Furthermore, we would question the robustness of the evidence produced to date: a questionnaire is not considered to represent vigorous and objective analysis. The survey work is not considered robust enough to contend with the objective, technical findings of the Oxfordshire SHMA and the housing need work that underpins the Local Plan; and certainly not to the degree that it should influence decisions on this issue to a significant degree. The weight that can be afforded to the survey is entirely questionable. Moreover, our client would query the apparent demographic bias within the evidence base and query whether this is a true reflection of the composition of Radley.</p>	<p>The NP seeks to complement rather than replace the SHMA guidelines by providing evidence of local needs, as envisaged in the SHMA itself. This is in accordance with para 50 of the NPPF which states the need to ‘identify the size, type, tenure and range of housing that is required in particular locations, reflecting local demand’. Barton Willmore’s view that a questionnaire survey is not capable of delivering “vigorous [stet] and objective analysis” is unusual, and not accepted by RPC. This one was competently done. The survey results are moreover consistent with what we have been told by Abingdon estate agents about demand for smaller market homes, and this evidence covers a wider geography. We would hope that Barton Willmore would wish to understand this evidence of local need rather than to dismiss it.</p>
Benefice Housing Group		<p>We endorse the plan (4.3.2) to include a scattering of downsize, independent-living, and care-home spaces within the development, not least because a healthy neighbourhood needs a mix of demographics. We also endorse the concern raised by the RNP in 4.3.1 that the Oxfordshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) does not seem to reflect the reality of local housing needs. This may be because the SHMA study restricts its research purely to the boundaries of the Vale of White Horse, and does not take into consideration the huge impact that the city of Oxford places upon housing demand within the Vale. We believe that it is this pressure which creates a far greater demand for the smallest housing units, and hence resonates with the RNP view that 70% of new housing (rather than 28%) should be ‘smaller’. However, we would go further than the recommendations in 4.3.2, to advocate for specific provision for young singles or couples seeking their first step on the housing ladder through the purchase of 1-bed or studio apartments as part of the NW Radley and South Kennington developments.</p>	<p>Views noted. A reference to the SHMA figures for Oxford City have also now been added to the plan.</p>
Pegasus for Redrow		<p>Question 4 of the online Neighbourhood Plan response form highlights the Parish Council’s desire for new housing development to take appropriate account of its evidence in respect of the local demand for housing (e.g. specific mix, tenure and size). My client has reviewed the helpful evidence supplied by the Parish Council, but wishes to highlight a potential conflict between Policy PP.4 and the District Council’s housing policy outlined in the VoWH Local Plan Part 1 and supporting evidence base documentation. In progressing our planning application my client will be mindful of the local demand for housing, seemingly smaller properties and bungalows, but is also required to assess and meet wider housing need across the district, in line with VoWH Local Plan Part 1 policies.</p>	<p>This is helpful. RPC recognises the need to conform with NPPF and Local Plan policies but considers that there is scope under these to take account of local evidence as well as the guidelines contained in the SHMA. The Plan policy is simply that the local evidence should be taken into account.</p>

10		I would support retirement apartments. But housing for young people and families needs to be provided.	Agreed
13		The responses to the survey appear to be from the older residents of our community and express an interest in downsizing to smaller properties. There is very little probability that our older residents will actually make the change to smaller housing. The future of our village lies with families and we believe that the housing mix should be biased towards enticing families into the village. There are already plenty of small properties to choose from in Abingdon for first time buyers. The village dynamic would change irrevocably if we built blocks of apartments which would ultimately be purchased by investors.	Views noted. The Plan supports the provision of some family housing but it is a question of proportion. Survey responses were not exclusively from the elderly; they included 223 from households whose members were under 60.
14		Agree. The councillor responsible for housing justified strategic development as a way to prevent ad-hoc development. Any further development would be a betrayal of this justification and be disproportionate in relation to the size of the village.	Support noted
17		Agree	Support noted
18		Three-storey developments such as those on the old MG site should be refused. They are out of character with the village.	View noted
19		Agree	Support noted
20		We would oppose any building above 2 storeys high & would welcome the inclusion of some single storey properties (other than retirement bungalows).	View noted
23		This should only be one of the factors taken into account and needs to be balanced with the likely demand from those wishing to move to Radley	Agreed
25		Agree. ThIs will ensure efficient use of the housing stock by freeing up existing housing in Radley which residents are seeking to downsize from.	Support noted
26		Yes. As above. In particular, mobile homes are less wasteful of space and can blend in with the natural environment-- so more of the environment can be left in place, to provide not only habitats but also a pleasant surround for the residents of the mobile homes, and provide privacy. Please, no more executive carbuncles.	Support noted, though we may not be able to prevent what this respondent calls 'executive carbuncles'.
27		Yes - the village should have a significant say in this.	RPC will do what it can to represent local people's views
28		Very good.	Support noted
29		Whilst the Parish Council's survey determined the need for downsizing homes there is still a shortage of larger family homes which used to be the mechanism by which people moved up the housing ladder. Sadly without affordable larger homes, people convert their small dwellings into larger homes, and stay put.	View noted.
30		I doubt any developer will agree to the above, RPC cannot bind a developer to selling houses to local residents, Ministry of Defence have purchased up 20 plus houses on new development in another local village	Agree RPC cannot require residents to sell to local people but we think it worthwhile to try to ensure that what developers build takes account of what local people need.
31		The developers will build exactly what they want to build.	View noted.

32		Agree	Support noted.
33		Agree	
35		I agree.	
36		Yes I agree with this	
	PP5	PP5. Provision of plots of land for self-build on the new sites will be supported.	
14		Yes but not priority and only if they are in keeping with current development	View noted
17		Agree	Support noted
18		Strongly support. This will reduce the monotony of typical new housing developments.	Support noted
19		Yes though safeguards on abuse by individual developers should be made - e.g. cannot be sold for 5years	View noted
20		Covenants should be in place to restrict the building of properties higher than 2 storeys.	This Plan does not set design standards. There are guidelines in the VWHDC Design Guide.
23		It's not clear how this would be enforced in practice. Not supported	View noted
25		No strong view. Important that any self build and estate build meet high design standards.	See response to respondent number 20
26		Good idea. Didn't see any such thing on the Radley College plans for Whites Lane.	No - there wasn't.
27		Yes - how would these plots be allocated and would existing residents be able to apply?	This would need to be done by VWHDC who unfortunately have no policy to support self-build at present.
29		I believe people should be given the opportunity to purchase plots of land on to which they can build their own property. The developers will not like this because they might be put to shame by those with aspirations other than for regulation size shoeboxes.	We are pressing for some land on the strategic sites to be allocated for self-build but cannot guarantee success.
30		I doubt developer will agree to this	View noted
31		N/a. As PP4.	
32		Approve	Support noted
33		Agree	
35		I agree.	

	CA2	CA2. RPC will oppose any proposals for the four mobile home sites to be converted to other uses.	
14		Yes	Support noted
17		Agree	
18		Support with these provisos	
19		mobile homes to be retained but are these the best locations for them? can the sites be better employed if alternative locations found?	RPC's policy is to retain the sites in their current location. Residents would be very unlikely to want to move elsewhere.
23		No opinion	Noted
24		Yes, the mobile home sites must be protected. They are an important part of our village.	Support noted
25		Strongly agree. Individuals in these sites have modest demands in terms of housing needs - which is a benefit to the wider community. Their needs must be respected and catered for.	
26		TOO RIGHT! I know quite a few people who live on these parks, and every single one is a very decent person who loves living where they do. There is a real community feel to the site over the bridge and I expect it is the same elsewhere. People who live there should not have to lose their happy homes and be uprooted. There is no problem with leaving things as they are. No doubt the Greedy Brigade would like to "develop" those places. Please resist such suggestions as strongly as possible.	
27		This depends on what the alternative use would be.	View noted
28		Yes, it would be most unfair on residents who have lived there for years and would have difficulty finding somewhere else to live.	Support noted
29		The mobile home parks are "affordable homes" and perhaps the Parish should include a further site for more mobile homes which would bring the number of dwellings per site to the target set by the Government and use less of the green belt in the process.	RPC would not wish to see further development in the Green Belt, whether of mobile or permanent homes, and there are no sites available in the parish outside the Green Belt.
31		I agree.	Support noted
32		Agree	
33		Agree	
35		I agree.	
36		I agree with this approach.	

	CA3	CA3. The village hall, playground and a playing field should continue to be located on Gooseacre, but need re-imagining, possibly with replacement buildings, so they better meet the aspirations of a flourishing and expanding village. RPC, together with the village hall committee and the freeholders, should prepare and implement a plan for achieving this.	
Jonathan Dockar Drysdale and Theresa Colton, owners of Gooseacre Farm		This seems to contradict PP9 below. If the village hall is going to be redeveloped on its existing site, then it stands to reason that the new facility is hardly likely to be ready before the old facility is removed. We understand that Radley College are keen to develop this site and relocate the village hall elsewhere. Surely the NP is missing a huge opportunity here to orchestrate the joint public contribution of two developers to create new, modern communal facilities for the village, in a convenient location, which will be fit for purpose for the lifetime of the new Local Plan and beyond. We suggest, therefore, that RPC should not miss this window of opportunity. The NP should consider all the opportunities which can be made available to the village community by acknowledging Radley South as a potential development site in the NP. This would include the relocation of the village hall and sports facilities, as well as the allotments, to a convenient location on Gooseacre Farm.	This issue has been considered at length and the decision taken that the policy to preserve Green Belt from further development should take precedence.
AWE		The relocation of the Village Hall and playing field is clearly contentious, and has been an on-going problem since 2008, as recorded on pp 19, 21 of the Draft NP. The existing site is owned by Radley College and leased to RPC. Playing fields to the south are on land owned by clients of AWEL. Radley College proposed a new site (May 2016) north of Church Lane, but this only received 37% approval in response, because “the site would be too far away from where many families live”. Subsequently, RPC did not support that relocation. The Radley South proposals would include a site for replacement facilities on land owned by the clients. The current proposal is to “re-imagine” (whatever this means) the facilities on the current site (CA.3) but this seems sub-optimal, with no clear idea what it means or how it would be funded. Also, the renewal of the lease and continued availability of the playing field on Radley South cannot be assured. The proposal this Report makes, on behalf of AWEL and the landowners, is to offer a new site as set out in the section below: ‘the merits of Radley South’.	This offer is noted but RPC does not support the development of the South Radley site.
Radley Col.		The majority of those who participated in an earlier college consultation supported the relocation suggestion (and we have in the past shared the evidence base for this) and this too was supported in your own consultation with 37% supporting a move and 32% objecting to a move. While we recognise a decision has to be made, and will respect a final outcome to this process, we feel it is a great shame, and a potential opportunity missed for the village, not to support the majority view. Particularly as a college-backed project on college land had greater funding certainty, and it is not now clear how development on the existing site will be funded.	The reasons for RPC’s decision are set out in the Plan. Anticipated funding sources are described in section 5. No firm offer from Radley College for development of the alternative North Radley site is currently on the table.
Radley Col.		If the Village Hall and parking is extended at the current site, this will erode green space and playing fields. The village is getting larger and we believe this is an unhelpful reduction in open amenity space. We also believe it is flawed to assume the new pitches planned at the Abingdon North development site can be considered as part of the solution to Radley village’s need - and certainly not without consultation with the residents of Abingdon	Only a small reduction in the open recreation area at the Gooseacre site is anticipated. As stated in the Plan, we consider that the proposed new playing fields in the west of the parish will be sufficient replacement.

Barton Willmore		Our client..... [notes that] 31% of residents ‘did not express a strong view either way’. It is considered that these findings are too vague and more definitive results need to be obtained.	The 31 % described as not expressing a strong view either way ticked ‘I have no strong view’ (28%) or ‘Other’ (3%). RPC was not seeking a particular outcome on the village hall location, only to understand what the village wanted. Some considerable care was taken on the wording so as not to ‘lead’ the answers, and we believe the results on the village hall are as robust as can reasonably be obtained.
Environment Agency		Section 4.4. Section 4.4.1 - It would be good here if the Plan acknowledges the local natural environment as a ‘facility’. This includes the Thames path, Radley Lakes, and woodlands with footpaths through them, providing public access. These habitats provide ‘Green Infrastructure’ which encourages residents and visitors to explore the natural environment. The natural environment has been proved to have a positive impact on mental health and this should be embraced through the Neighbourhood Plan.	This is agreed and references have been added.
Environment Agency		Section 4.4.2 - It is important that improving all facilities forms part of the Neighbourhood Plan, and improvements and enhancements to semi-natural habitats should be included in this. The Parish is home to important protected species including otters, water voles and hedgehogs, and these species can be used as an indication of the overall health of habitats. The Parish should seek to improve the network of Green Infrastructure by linking established routes, such as the Thames Pathway, with other footpaths. Small watercourses and ditch networks can often be easily incorporated into these networks and provide interesting features for both aquatic wildlife and people.	Agreed. This is a central feature of policies on the Radley Lakes covered in section 4.6.1.
10		I do not think the village hall should be at Gooseacre. I think it should be closer to the church.	View noted.
14		The current village hall is old, ugly and in poor repair. We will lose some of the current recreational area in redeveloping it at this site. The lease for the current site will expire just outside this plan period and we may end up with nothing and wasted investment. This needs to be thought about	There will be a working group to look into the possibilities for the site which will take account of all these issues before any final decisions are taken.
15		Please take into the account the off road parking and vehicular access required at the village hall as the village expands to avoid on street parking in Gooseacre which can sometimes become a hazard.	Agreed that this is important.
17		Agree	
18		Opposing proposed development on Gooseacre while expecting Radley College to donate land and access rights (CA6, PP13, A10) takes the College’s goodwill for granted and is unwise.	View noted.
19		Creation of hall/shop/pub/station facilities should be considered as a whole e.g. combined facility at pub/station/allotment site??	RPC policy is that the village hall and playing field should be adjacent. The allotment site is not big enough for a playing field.
20		Agree that refurbishing at least is needed, but the lease should be renegotiated before large sums of money are committed to redeveloping the site.	Agreed.
23		The plan to move the village hall received majority support. It’s possible that the majority would have been greater if it had been made clearer to those of “no opinion” of the importance of their opinion in delivering a clearer decision. It’s also possible that the current location would not be seen to be the most convenient location after the developments have been completed.	View noted.

24		Our village hall is showing its age. It is a shame we could not take advantage of Radley College's offer to build a new one, but I understand the reasons for this. I think replacement is the only answer. It would then be more attractive for users and should therefore be able to recoup some of the costs.	View noted.
25		Agree with retention of facilities here, and agree that these should be upgraded. Improved pedestrian access from all parts of the village to the hall and playground is key.	View noted.
26		In doing so, do not diminish the amount of space available for playing. Also, do not be fooled by promises of money from certain quarters in exchange for concessions elsewhere.	View noted.
27		Agreed - this is a good site but parking for an extended facility would need to be carefully considered	View noted.
28		Yes, there are likely to be more children in the new houses and community activities are important as a way of bringing together current and future residents to have a continued sense of community.	View noted.
29		The village should ensure that provision for a full size playing field is maintained in the plan it produces. Where it is located is not an issue as far as I am concerned.	Agreed that this is desirable if possible
30		RPC should support the clear majority vote of 37% of respondents who voted for a new village hall in Church Road which is nearer to school, church and 250 new houses.	View noted, but some of the new houses will be closer to Gooseacre than Church Road.
31		I agree.	
32		Agree	
33		Agree. I would have preferred the move to Church Rd but understand the reasons for not doing so	View noted.
35		I agree.	
36		I fully support this strategy.	

	CA4	CA4. The community shop should remain near its current location, but if achievable on a larger site. RPC and the shop management committee should explore the practicability of developing the allotment site for this purpose.	
Radley Village Shop Management Committee		1. Terminology when referring to Radley Village Shop. a. We would like it made clear in the Neighbourhood Plan that 'the community shop' is Radley Village Shop. We would like a statement of our trading name early on in the Plan and it made clear that all mentions of 'the community shop' in the Plan refer to Radley Village Shop. b. We would also like to see consistent terminology when referring to Radley Village Shop rather than the current mixture of 'the community shop' and 'the village shop', and even in PP.2 'The Village community shop'. This would avoid any potential confusion among those readers of the plan who do not have personal knowledge of the village as to how many shops Radley currently has. The majority of references are to 'the community shop', so we suggest standardising on that term and removing the references to 'village shop' on pages 11, 14, 21, 22 and 23. In Map 4, we would like the key to read 'D Radley Village Shop (community shop)'. This would be consistent with giving the name of the pub against G in the key. d. There is also a mixture of references to 'Radley Village Shop Committee' (p.11), 'the Village Shop Committee' (p.23), 'the shop management committee' (CA.4 p.23), 'the Shop Management Committee' (p.48) and 'Radley Village Shop Management Committee' (p.49). The full and correct name is 'Radley Village Shop Management Committee', which at the very least should be used in the list on page 23. If you want to use a shorter version, we would prefer 'the shop management committee' (all lower case).	The terminology has been modified as suggested.
Barton Willmore		Our client wishes to query the basis of CA4 and whether there is any evidence base to support the retention within the current location. It is considered that this is also relevant to CA3 above and our client would advise that further work needs to be undertaken in respect of both CA3 and CA4 to substantiate this position and fully understand community views.	The evidence is reported in RPC's Report on the Neighbourhood Plan consultation May 2016. See pages 4 to 6 for discussion of views on the village hall location and pages 11 & 12 for views relating to the community shop location.
7		3. Shop. Are we going to get some younger staff that are not so muddled up on the till. Plus lower prices that's why people boycott and go elsewhere to shop for this forgotten. 4. Putting the shop here have they considered the extra traffic going from the school down on the narrow part of the road. The road safety officer of the police should have his say here. Putting in on a blind bend that is what is wrong with it now.	3 is a matter for the shop management committee. RPC and the shop management committee consider the current location to be adequate if not ideal.
14		Yes	
15		Or the area around the pub as outlined in response to PP2 CA1.	Agreed
17		Agree	
18		Support	
19		See CA3	
20		Agree.	
23		Supported	

24		Yes a larger community shop is essential, especially if we are competing with a new shop on the South Kennington site. Careful thought should be given to access though as some of the delivery lorries are large!	View noted.
25		No strong view re location, but a bigger site likely to be required commensurate with expansion in village population.	View noted.
26		Definitely NOT the allotment. There is nothing wrong at all with the current location. It is very suitable, being on level ground with the car park outside (nearly all the spaces are empty during the day). It is accessible from all areas. Perhaps it would be possible to purchase one of the ground floor flats in order to expand. In the long run this would incur less expense and trouble than re-siting the shop.	View noted. Purchasing the adjacent flat has been thought about but not considered practicable.
27		Yes - I would support this and it would keep the shop near to the station and accessible to residents of the village	View noted.
28		Yes to the keeping the shop in the same area, but allotments are not that suitable and thought needs to be given to the traffic situation and safety.	View noted.
29		No comment	
30		Agree	
31		I agree, but NOT on the allotment site.	View noted.
32		Agree	
33		Strongly agree	
35		I agree.	
36		The shop needs larger premises even if the allotments prove to be unsuitable.	View noted.
	CA5	CA5. RPC should approach local landowners to identify a suitable site for additional allotments, and for a replacement site for the existing allotments, if needed.	
Jonathan Dockar Drysedale and Theresa Colton, owners of Gooseacre Farm		We are willing to release land for an alternative allotment site on part of Gooseacre Farm once Radley South is allocated for development in LPPt2.	Offer noted but RPC does not support the development of the south Radley site.
14		Yes	
17		Agree	
18		Strongly support. We must not end up with less allotment area or fewer allotments.	View noted.
19		Agree	
20		Agree.	

23		Supported	
25		Agree	
26		“Local landowners” sounds like a euphemism for “Radley College”. Other sites would not be suitable since it takes many years and a lot of input to make ground fertile. At least 4 of the allotment holders grow in the organic way. The Soil Association can tell you that just going in overnight and not using chemical props, will not create organic gardening or agriculture. If the land has been used for inorganic large scale agriculture it will be largely barren, having been deprived of its natural life by enormous amounts of chemicals, and will possibly be home to slugs since farmers commonly use slug “bait” -- note the name -- which actually attracts them!	Radley College is not the only local landowner. These points will be taken into account in considering alternative sites.
27		Yes - agreed	
29		A site was identified along with the costs of converting to allotment use. Current allotment holders ought to be asked if they agree to move.	View noted.
30		RPC never mention that another allotment site (privately owned) already exists in Lower Radley, which still has a couple of vacant plots. May be this allotment site could be extended to adjacent field.	The text includes a reference to this site.
31		I agree.	
32		Agree	
33		Agree	
35		I agree.	
36		Perhaps landowners/developers could be approached for a larger village shop site.	Greene King have already been approached and no other potential sites are equally central
	CA6	CA6. RPC should work with Radley College to provide a site for an additional cemetery.	
Jonathan Dockar Drysdale and Theresa Colton, owners of Gooseacre Farm		On a personal note, our father’s ashes lie in Radley cemetery. We know how important it was to him for this to be so. We are therefore naturally very keen that whatever steps are necessary should be taken to protect the character and sanctity of this important facility, now and for future generations. We would take this opportunity publicly to thank Radley College for considering this proposal.	View noted.
Barton Willmore		Our client confirms that this has been broadly agreed, however we would make the point again that this is another example of consultation from the Parish Council being brief at best. This is not a policy, and an evidence base should be provided, demonstrating why an additional cemetery is needed along with associated timeframes for delivery.	We are keen to discuss the precise location and timescale with Radley College as soon as they are ready. Evidence of need has been added to the Plan.

Benefice housing group		We re-iterate the need (highlighted in points 2.1 and 4.4 of the Neighbourhood Plan) – agreed by Radley College (4.42) – that a new burial ground needs to be allocated. If this is separate from the existing one then a car park needs to be provided also. If it is close by the existing one, then consideration needs to be made to enlarging the existing car park for the school/ burial ground. We would like to raise the question as to whether it is anticipated that the new burial ground would be a consecrated or civic space?	View noted.
2		Along with a new cemetery we will need a car park or, if adjacent to the present one, a much bigger car park. The present one is barely adequate for everyday school/church use and is completely overwhelmed by large weddings and funerals - cars are just parked along Church Road and St James Road.	View noted.
14		Yes	Support noted
17		No comment	
18		Agreed but see response to CA3.	Support noted
19		Agree	
20		Agree.	
23		Supported	
24		This is important.	
25		Agree	
26		I wonder where such a site would be? The sensible place would have been part of the field behind the original cemetery -- but now that is planned as housing development.	View noted.
		What about the field which runs from the church car park up towards the allotments?	The new allotments are likely to be in this area
		By the way, the last bit of that field -- furthest from the church-- would make a reasonable site for the shop, being just a few yards up the road from now, nearer to the school and near to the exit from the big new housing development.	This possibility will be raised with the landowners
27		Yes - agreed	Support noted
29		With an increased proposed population, the college ought to be providing the additional burial ground out of its land ownership as it is making a huge amount of money developing the greenbelt land for housing,	View noted.
30		Agree	Support noted
31		Radley College should already have this sorted. I doubt that they care a fig for the residents of Radley.	View noted.
32		Agree	Support noted
33		Agree	
35		No opinion.	

	PP6	PP6. The land around the Bowyer Arms is an asset of community value and should be considered as a location for community facilities if it is proposed for development.	
Barton Willmore		This statement is incorrect on two counts. Firstly, it is the Bowyer Arms which is listed as an Asset of Community Value (ref: 13V07/1) and not the associated car park. Secondly, National Policy is explicit in noting that a listed Asset of Community Value (ACV) simply places a moratorium on sale by the landowner, to give the community a fair chance to make a bid to buy the asset on the open market. The provision does not restrict what the owner can do with the asset in land use terms, as this is dealt with via the planning process. The ACV is nonetheless a consideration. The Parish should make clear that the asset is not limited to a community use in perpetuity but that there is potential' to consider the introduction of new community facilities if the site becomes available for development in the future.	Statement has been corrected.
14		Should be developed into green recreational space	View noted.
17		Agree	Support noted
18		Support	
19		See CA3	
20		Agree, negotiations with Greene King should continue.	Greene King are not open to negotiation at present.
23		Supported	Support noted
24		It is a shame the village is unable to use this for development of a new community shop. The site would be perfect.	View noted.
25		Agree	Support noted
26		I believe it belongs to the Brewery?	Yes
26		We do not need any more "community facilities". The area near the entrance to the station is busy enough already, with the traffic for the station -- very many pick-ups and set-downs in addition to the car parking -- the pub, and the bus stops. NO MORE URBANISATION in that place please. To increase the use there would be very dangerous, what with the many entrances to the area -- New Road, pub, station, Turners Close, and most dangerous of all, the private road off the bus stop, behind the barrier. And the area is not suitable as a park either. In the past we have had problems with juvenile vandalism in that location and it is more appropriate for play park to be where the children live -- that is on the new housing estates and near the Village Hall.	View noted. RPC takes the view that a larger village shop and associated open space would be beneficial.
28		OK, but consider safety issues on the bend and around the busy station. It should not be a community facility that involves people driving to it. There is no parking because it is taken by rail travellers and the rest of the area has yellow lines.	View noted.
29		Perhaps the Village ought to buy the pub off Greene King and convert part of it into a shop. .	RPC will consider making an offer if the pub comes up for sale.
30		This area needs tidying up and planting with seats, grants may be available from VWHDC	View noted.

31		Vague.	View noted.
32		Very supportive	Support noted
33		Agree	
35		I agree.	
36		I agree.	
	PP7&8	PP7 & 8 The North-West Radley housing site should include a playground towards its north end. The South Kennington housing site should also include a playground and should reserve a space for a shop.	
Jonathan Dockar Drysdale and Theresa Colton, owners of Gooseacre Farm		If our proposals for Radley South are accepted, then there could be sufficient space made available on Gooseacre Farm to provide an additional playground area to cater for the southern end of the village.	Offer noted
Barton Willmore		Our client objects to the stipulation that a playground should include a playground towards its north end. While appropriate provision will be made for open space, including children's play areas, the location and quantum of such features will be explored as part of the ongoing masterplanning process with the District Council and stakeholders, coupled with an understanding of feedback from the recent public consultation events. The policy is unsubstantiated and inappropriate in its current form.	We do not agree. The location of the playground on the site should be discussed with the parish council to ensure that it best complements existing facilities and contributes to the integration of the new community with the old. Our view is supported by the Vale's Supplementary Planning Document on Developer Contributions
Benefice housing group		We appreciate the diligence undertaken by Radley Parish Council (point 3.8) in carrying out a survey of all households in Radley Parish, and endorse its conclusion that a retail facility is required to support new and existing households in South Kennington (4.4.2). However, we suggest a possible rethink of the proposed location and sole function of this facility. A public building designed with flexible usage in mind, and located at the centre of the South Kennington housing development (possibly near to the proposed playground), would create a far stronger neighbourhood spirit. The proportion of this space allocated to retail could then be gauged in proportion to the emerging needs/demands of the community – such as hall/room bookings or community office space – or it could even host a seasonal pop-up café to service the users of the playground. Kennington already boasts more than 40 village institutions, and there is often pressure on meeting space	A requirement that a space should be provided for a community room has been added to the draft Plan.
Radley Village Shop		We are concerned about the impact on our passing trade of a shop on the South Kennington site, especially as the new shop would be considerably larger and possibly part of a national chain perceived as being cheaper than Radley Village Shop.	View noted. However, the Plan also has to consider the needs of those who live in or near the proposed south Kennington development

Pegasus for Redrow		Policy PP8 of the RNP states that the South Kennington development should include a playground and reserve space for a shop. As displayed on the plans at the exhibition provision has been made for a play area. Additionally, as shown on the plans, my client is currently pursuing the potential to provide a retail unit as part of any planning application. It is also noted that page 23 of the RNP states a need for the refurbishment of the Playfield Road pavilion. My client is happy for this project to be considered as part of any package of planning obligations to be drawn up through the planning application process. Any contribution would be subject to meeting the relevant Community Infrastructure Levy regulations.	Agreed that support for the refurbishment of the Playfield Road pavilion will be subject to the CIL regulations. Support for the provision of a play area and retail unit is welcome.
14		As long as this does not impact on existing properties which might be adjacent to any play area in respect to noise and antisocial behaviour	View noted.
17		Agree but object to it being called the 'South Kennington Site'	View noted but this is the name used in the Local Plan and to depart from it could cause confusion.
18		Support	
19		Agree	
20		Agree with the playground position as shown on the NW Radley site proposal document displayed at Radley College on 20/1/17.	View noted.
23		Not sure why the North end is the best location for the playground, a central location may be better. Support PP8.	This location is preferred because it better complements existing provision at Gooseacre.
24		I am concerned that a large enterprise such as the Co-op would be a serious challenge to the community shop, but I don't know how to alleviate this.	View noted.
25		Yes- communal facilities are going to be key for new developments.	Support noted
26		Yes.	
28		Yes, it would be needed for that area, caught between the Co-op and Radley Village Shop.	View noted.
29		All new developments ought to provide play facilities as a matter of course. A shop at the S Kennington site would be an advantage to residents and would not detract from the Radley Village Shop unless the shop were to be very close to the main road between Radley and Kennington, when it would cost the Radley Village Shop passing trade.	View noted.
30		Any new playground should be sited away from existing dwellings in Selwyn Crescent and Ferny Close. Use the existing village shop rather than build new shop	View noted.
31		More open spaces than playgrounds are essential and houses should not be built cheek by jowl as they have been on Ladygrove, Didcot, for example.	View noted.
32		Agree	Support noted
33		Agree	
35		I agree.	

	PP9	PP9. Where replacement sites or buildings are needed for community facilities they should, if practicable, be ready before the old facilities are removed.	
Jonathan Dockar Drysdale and Theresa Colton, owners of Gooseacre Farm		One significant benefit of our proposed scheme for Radley South is that the site for many of these replacement facilities (ie village hall, allotments, playing fields etc) can be made available, subject to planning, at short notice, and certainly in advance of any of the existing facilities being removed.	View noted.
Radley Village Shop		Should the shop relocate to the allotment site, it goes without saying that the shop must be able to continue trading from its existing premises while the new premises are being built and fitted out.	Agreed.
14		Yes	Support noted
18		Support	
19		Agree see CA3	
20		Absolutely agree with this.	
23		Supported	
25		Agree	
26		In theory, but in the case of buildings, that is not necessarily sensible-- eg if a new Village Hall were being built, it should go on the same site as the old one.	The policy will be pursued only if practicable.
28		Of course.	Support noted
29		Developers have a happy knack of failing to provide community facilities because the sale of their houses do not progress as they thought they would. Such Community Facilities usually fail to be built because of this strategy and the Developer gets let off the hook. We should make sure our plan cannot be usurped in this way.	RPC will do what it can to ensure this does not happen in Radley.
30		Yes	Support noted
31		I agree, but "must be" - not "should be, if practicable". The developers, with the support of V.W.H.D.C. and Radley College, already have the whip hand.	View noted.
32		Definitely	Support noted
33		Agree, but only if this does not conflict with achieving the best solution overall	View noted.
35		I agree.	Support noted

	CA7	CA7. RPC will press for and support the expansion of Radley’s primary school on or near its present site to be achieved either through a high quality replacement building or extension.	
OCC		Radley Primary School is referred to in 4.5.1 as “not large enough to provide a place every year for every Radley child seeking a place there.” Most years, all on-time, in-catchment applicants can be admitted, but there have been occasional instances of the school being over-subscribed from within catchment. The school is certainly very full, and almost entirely with in-catchment children. We agree that additional primary school capacity will be needed to meet the needs of housing growth. Based on the proposal for 240 new homes, and allowing for some spare capacity, our recommendation is that the school expands to 1 form entry. Additional site area will be required, and we hope to work with Radley College to achieve this. We note that Policy CA.7 states that “RPC will press for and support the expansion of Radley’s primary school on or near its present site to be achieved in such a way that there is a high quality replacement building or extension, with resulting capacity sufficient to serve all in the parish except for those closer to neighbouring schools.”	This is helpful and reflected in the revised version
Barton Willmore		The College fully supports the principle of expanding the Primary School on or near its present site and looks forward to working with the relevant parties to take this forward constructively.	It was agreed at a meeting on 13 March that the College should lead a group to consider how this can be taken forward. RPC welcomes this
Jonathan Dockar Drysdale and Theresa Colton, owners of Gooseacre Farm		Any new development in Radley Village, including Radley North West as well as Radley South, is likely to attract young families with children to the village. We therefore fully support the expansion of the primary school with high quality educational facilities fit to serve the enlarged community for the life of the Local Plan and beyond	Support noted
Benefice Housing Group		We endorse plans identified under point 4.5.1 to expand provision at Radley Primary School – so as to prevent unnecessary school commutes from Radley into Kennington or Abingdon. A thriving local primary school is essential if the newly enlarged Radley is to thrive as a village.	

Radley Primary School		Current site is inappropriate for expansion As Radley Primary School has approx 100 pupils, plus the Foundation Stage, and schooling is a key consideration when people choose to move to a location, more thought could have been given to this. It would seem clear that the school should expand to be a one Form per year school and the current facilities are not appropriate for this. The classrooms for Key Stage 2 are already too small, buildings are in need of repair and the Hall will not be big enough to either cater for the pupils or be able to hold whole school assemblies. Car parking is already inadequate. It is difficult to see how funding for extending the Primary School will be achievable as a result of the RNCP. This plan could potentially endanger the long term viability of our village school considerably diminishing the appeal of Radley. Surely the RNCP should go further in terms of lobbying for a new build (not simply extended) Primary School of at least one form entry and with potential for future expansion.	All of this is noted. The comments do not seem to recognise the extent to which RPC has sought to engage with the school as a key village stakeholder and also to facilitate discussion between the College and OCC about innovative approaches to its future. The current position is that the College have agreed to lead a group to consider how proposals might best be taken forward at a practical level. Pending that the NP has retained the possibility of enlargement as well as rebuild.
Radley primary school		While it is pleasing that the RNCP is supportive of a larger Primary School it is not clear how the RNCP will facilitate the delivery of one. The Primary School is striving to have the best possible facilities and that will surely benefit the village as a vibrant and attractive place to live. To achieve this, it is important that real thought be given to how to deliver something above the minimum by working together. For example, the school's opinion has not been sought on the proposal to relocate the Village Hall. However, there is great merit for the school and village hall and appropriate playing facilities to be co-located. This could create a real hub for the Village and may help address wider pinch points such as parking.	
2		Along with a new cemetery we will need a car park or, if adjacent to the present one, a much bigger car park. The present one is barely adequate for everyday school/church use and is completely overwhelmed by large weddings and funerals - cars are just parked along Church Road and St James Road.	All these points are noted and a reference to nursery facilities has been added
10		I believe that expansion of Radley Primary School is essential (to one form entry as a minimum) to ensure its future viability. Small schools have difficulty with budgets as they cannot achieve economies of scale, and my experience from my previous town shows small (good schools) can be at risk of closure.	Support noted
11		Primary Education: If the primary school in Radley was extended to take full year entry it would present a lot of problems eg drains, not enough toilets, hall too small (already 2 sittings for dinner), not enough storage. Radley Primary School also provides nursery facilities so am not quite sure why we are supporting St Swithuns nursery. A new purpose built school would be more beneficial long term.	All these points are noted and a reference to Radley nursery facilities has been added. The reason why this had previously been done for Kennington is that the need there had been specifically raised by St Swithun's school.
12		PRIMARY EDUCATION The Primary School can not be extended as the main school would not be able to cope with extra demands put on the hall space (used for lunches), toilets, drains, classroom sizes and the gas supply at present is no sufficient enough to heat the school. Rebuilding another school which will last much longer is the only best possible outcome for the future of the local village children.	See response to Primary School comment

13		How did we get from a position of an offer of a fully funded primary school, overlooking fantastic playing fields in a location close to a new village hall, the church and shopping facilities to your proposal of add-ons to an existing 1950s crumbling building? There was a majority vote in favour of creating a new village centre. Why has the majority view been dismissed at the detriment of families and the children in the village? There is absolutely no money in the government pot to fund the day-to-day running of the school, let alone any new buildings. Radley children are our future and we are appalled that you have chosen not to support and misrepresented the fantastic opportunity offered to us in the Radley College Master Plan. We believe that you are completely failing the children in our village and are out of touch with families of today. If parents were consulted you would have received very different response data.	The Radley College offer to fund a new primary school was withdrawn by them before the RPC consultation on the NP. Parents were included in that exercise as were all residents. The Plan explains why it was decided to support the village hall remaining on its current site.
14		Yes but preventing any loss of school play and sports areas. It is unfortunate that RPC and the village were not more supportive of Radley College's original proposal to build a new school and new village centre	
17		Agree	Support noted
18		Support; but see my answer to CA3. This depends on the goodwill of Radley College.	
20		We would support this.	
23		Supported	
25		Strongly agree. This is fundamental for residents. Not meeting demand locally will require elaborate solutions whereby parents are transporting children across the Vale to other schools, further generating traffic, stress and eroding quality of life for all.	
26		Do not "replace" such a beautiful historic building. Extending is a better option -- or splitting over 2 (parallel) sites -- would be a better idea. (Not to split infant from junior, as that would cause a problem for child-pick-up.)	Views noted
28		Certainly.	Support noted
29		Support this proposal	
31		I agree. But are we to be lumbered with a three storey building?	
32		Approve	
33		Agree	
35		I agree.	
36		I agree	

	CA8	CA8. RPC will press for and support the expansion of nursery facilities at St Swithun's primary school.	
OCC		St Swithun's Primary School in Kennington is referred to in 4.5.1 as having "sufficient capacity to provide for children living in Kennington and in the north end of Radley parish when the proposed 270 new homes on the North Kennington site have been developed. It currently has a few vacancies in the main school." To elaborate, the school only has a few spare places, but this is because it currently accommodates significant numbers of children from outside its catchment, in particular living in Oxford or Abingdon. The expectation is that, as additional places are provided in Abingdon and Oxford, this will release space in St Swithun's for more local children. We do not expect to further expand St Swithun's Primary School.	This is helpful and reflected in the revised version
OCC		For Kennington, it is stated in 4.5.1 that "nursery provision is at present insufficient and will be further challenged by the proposed new development". 4.5.2 then states the need "to ensure that the shortfall in nursery places is addressed and funding from the Community Infrastructure Levy applied" and policy CA8 states that "RPC will press for and support the expansion of nursery facilities at St Swithun's primary school." There are a number of different providers of early education and childcare within the village. County Council sufficiency data indicates that the available early years provision in the Kennington and South Hinksey ward currently just meets the need of the local population, but additional capacity would be required to meet additional demand for places created by housing developments. Information on the availability of early years and childcare provision is available at Childcare and Early Education Family Information Director	
Benefice housing group		We are grateful that conversation about nursery places is already underway, and encouraged to see that the RNP cites allocation of CIL money towards expanding nursery provision in the village.	Support noted
Pegasus for Redrow		My client notes that several of the Questions (e.g. CA.8, PP.10, PP.18 and CA.13) on the Neighbourhood Plan response form relate to boosting the capacity of local infrastructure (highways, drainage and social). My client fully acknowledges the importance of this issue and is committed to mitigating the impact of the South Kennington development on local infrastructure through the planning application process. Indeed, to this end, my client's consultant team have already started progressing discussions with the relevant statutory bodies. When a planning application is submitted to the District Council, the District Council will formally consult all of the relevant statutory bodies to confirm the capacity of local infrastructure and the mitigation requirements which the proposed development will need to provide and adhere to.	Noted
10		I don't think we should be supporting expansion of Nursery places in Kennington, which is in competition with the Nursery at Radley Primary. I understand that Radley Primary's nursery is full and we need to ensure it is fully supported to maintain its future viability.	The text has been amended to include support for Radley nursery facilities

14		Yes	Support noted. On Radley nursery facilities see the response to respondent number 10.
17		Agree	
18		No view.	
20		Agree.	
23		Supported	
25		Agree, but nursery facilities needed in Radley itself.	
26		Good idea.	
28		This will be much needed if the new houses are bought by families. Considering the cost of many homes in Radley, the new houses should give more opportunity for families to move into the village.	
29		Support this proposal	
32		Approve	
33		Agree	
35		I agree.	
	PP10	PP10. Developers of the NW Radley and South Kennington strategic housing sites should either provide a site for a new surgery or should contribute to new or expanded facilities elsewhere in Abingdon or Kennington.	
Barton Willmore		Development of the site at North West Radley will make appropriate contributions in accordance with the Vale's adopted CIL Charging Schedule and Planning Obligations SPD. No evidence has been provided as part of the RNP process that would justify the requirement for a new surgery. Moreover, our client would welcome any information which has been sought from previous engagement with CCG by the Parish Council. In the absence of such evidence the RNP is flawed.	RPC met with the CCG on 27 June and they confirmed that extra capacity is needed in the North Abingdon area. The likelihood is that this will be provided on the North Abingdon site, but will need to be funded on a wider basis. See also the CCG consultation response below.
Owners of Gooseacre Farm		If Radley South is allocated as a strategic site, the combined developments will offer the opportunity for some holistic community planning solutions, and a significant combined funding contribution to realise them.	A holistic solution need not be dependant on development of the South Radley site, which is not supported.
Benefice housing group		We resonate with the conclusions in point 4.5.1 that there are already long delays in service provision at Kennington Health Centre, and highlight the critical need for the local Clinical Commissioning Group to have a plan (and facilities) in place for dealing with the medical needs of the new residents before they arrive.	Support noted
Oxfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group		Health and GP services are an important component of any community. Any development over 200 units would impact locally on health service delivery. The CCG would look to provide new facilities or support the existing provision for your area to expand. To support this increase the CCG would look for CIL or Section 106 funding to support this important infrastructure development to ensure the health needs of the local population are met.	These comments are helpful and have been followed up by a meeting on 27 June

10		I don't think we should have a doctor's surgery in Radley. It would be better for existing Abingdon surgeries to provide the services, recruiting more GPs, nurses, physiotherapists, etc as appropriate.	The current CCG thinking is that extra capacity should be made available on the North Abingdon site, but linked to the Long Furlong practice in Abingdon
14		Yes	Support noted
17		Agree	
18		Support	
19		Agree with local facility but funding elsewhere is vague, unlikely to happen and increase traffic etc and difficult for those with mobility issues	These points are noted. It is proposed that there should be a bus service between Radley and the North Abingdon site, where a new surgery might be located.
20		Agree.	Support noted
23		Supported	
24		Yes this is essential.	
25		Agree	
26		yes.	
27		Yes - this is critical to the wellbeing of both the villagers and the NHS ability to offer key services	
28		Definitely, as the doctors in Abingdon are already really stretched and there are significantly longer waiting times to get appointments nowadays.	
29		Sadly it is the Doctors which will be short supply not the building in which to house them. Development should not be permitted unless General Practices in the locality have the capacity to take new patients.	It is recognised that the supply of doctors is an issue as well as the supply of surgery space, but that is outside the scope of the NP
30		Agree	Support noted
31		"Must" not "should". At a conservative estimate the developers will walk away with £100,000,000. They can easily afford this cost. Also, Radley College must contribute as it will be making a huge profit from the sale of the land.	
32		Very necessary	
33		Agree	
35		I agree.	
36		I agree.	
37		The acknowledgement of new / additional healthcare provision is welcomed. The CCG is now liaising with the VWHDC.	

	CA9,PP11 and PP12	CA9, PP11 and PP12 promote RPC's strategy for the Radley Lakes area.	
OCC		The draft Plan discusses concerns regarding the condition of the existing road access via Thrupp Lane. We recognise these concerns, but it should not be intimated that there is a quick or easy solution. For example, given the Green Belt status, it is not clear that new roads or more development as are suggested are possible. Closure of a Byway Open to all Traffic (BOAT) would not be straightforward nor the outcome guaranteed. It may also not be the case that the County Council would adopt any new road and thereby accept responsibility for additional maintenance.	The draft plan recognises the challenges. The Plan does not assume that the proposed new road would be adopted by OCC.
OCC		The Neighbourhood Plan should not include proposals for roads etc which are not likely to be able to be achieved given the powers of the planning authorities. Further consideration should be given to the text of policies 11 and 12 and the related Community Action 9, and we would welcome discussion with yourselves and District officers.	The access proposal is a Community Action and the Planning Policy does not depend on it being delivered. Agree that PP11 and 12 needed further attention and following discussion with OCC and the Vale they have been revised
Abingdon Naturalists Society (David Guyancourt)		Para. 25. The uses certainly conflict, but I am not clear what 'strategic framework' is being referred to? The mineral extraction boundary is accepted in the RNP as fait accomplis, yet Orchard Lake and the marshy area adjoining the Lake on the west side (Calfrey's Marsh) are part of the Local Wildlife Site designated in 2006 by OCC. I would propose that a concession be sought to exclude the LWS part of the planned minerals extraction area. I would also suggest that 'nature conservation' should be prioritised in the wording for this wildlife site.	Sympathise with the substance of these points, but minerals are outside the scope of Neighbourhood Plans
Abingdon Naturalists Society		Para. 26. Orchard Lake and Calfrey's Marsh are the areas of greatest ecological interest in the Radley Lakes area and will be lost if mineral extraction goes ahead. Orchard Lake is also very beautiful and RPC should, I believe, be fighting to conserve this area and prevent its destruction. I have also attached a document "MW.0148/15 - Thrupp Review of Planning Permission Scoping Opinion on behalf of Abingdon Naturalists Society" sent to OCC in December 2015. This gives details of the rare and protected wildlife present in this area	
Abingdon Naturalists Society		Page 27. Comment re boundary possibly including Barton Field area. It is mainly Abingdon residents who use this site. I am warden of Barton Fields and lead the Abingdon Naturalists' Green Team who have managed this nature reserve for fourteen years on behalf the Vale District Council who are the owners. Over the past decade we have enhanced the site by creating wildflower rich areas, ponds etc. The Vale Council and Abingdon-on-Thames Town Council provide part-fund, to defray our management costs. If the Radley Parish boundary were to be moved to include Barton Fields, I would hope that RPC would continue to fund the Green Team's management of the nature reserve. The Green Team regularly organise school and other children's visits to the nature reserve to study the wildlife.	Any inclusion of Barton Fields would depend on agreement with Abingdon Naturalists and Abingdon-on-Thames town council. RPC would be looking for the council to continue their financial support.
AWE		This is clearly an imaginative scheme and is supported by this Report; it is a huge project involving many parties. Also, the new access road to Audlett Drive, Abingdon would relieve Thrupp Lane. Clearly, this would be an expensive project and there would be many other calls on funds raised by way of S106 and CIL. However, with only modest housing proposals (the NW Radley strategic site and the Old Coal Yard), that funding would be also modest. Funds derived from the other two strategic sites would surely be directed to Abingdon and Kennington. The additional housing site at Radley South would significantly increase the funding available, which is referred to in the section on 'merits' below.	Noted, but Radley South is not supported for development by the Local Plan

Jonathan Dockar Drysdale and Theresa Colton, owners of Gooseacre Farm		We thoroughly endorse this strategy. When we lived with our parents at Pumney Farm, Lower Radley, they tried for many years to establish a protected wildfowl reserve on the gravel pits alongside our home. Unfortunately, this never materialised because of the compulsory purchase order placed on the pits, which were used to accommodate fly ash from Didcot Power Station. It is now almost fifty years on. Didcot is now closed, Pumney’s gravel pits are only a memory, but the vision of a nature reserve and bird sanctuary on the remaining lakes remains as valid as ever. We very much hope that this initiative is successful.	Support noted
Environment Agency		We have identified flood risk issues with the proposals in the Neighbourhood Plan to ‘support’ the commercial redevelopment of the John Curtis site and also the proposal for a new road between the John Curtis site and Audlett Drive. The site – and the proposed routes for a new road – are both located in Flood Zones 2 and 3.Given these requirements, we would insist that any proposals for the redevelopment of the John Curtis – including any indication of ‘supporting’ redevelopment proposals – and the potential construction route for a new road, would need to pass the Sequential Test (and Exception Test where required) and be subject to a Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. We would strongly advise that you liaise with Vale of White Horse District Council on these matters at the earliest opportunity. If these developments are put forward in future versions of the plan without sufficient evidence that flood risk has been properly accounted for, we are likely to find the Plan unsound.	The text has been revised to point out the extent of Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3 and to require a flood risk assessment and any necessary mitigation before permission is granted for any development. The EA has been consulted on these changes, which it has welcomed
Environment Agency		We have records that landfilling has probably taken place at the allotment and John Curtis sites within the Plan area – both of which are identified for potential development. These records indicate that any landfilling at these sites are likely to have occurred prior to landfill licensing being required (from 1976). As such we hold only very limited information on these sites. Records do indicate an application for a licence to carry out landfilling in a specific area of the John Curtis site was submitted in the 1980s, but was withdrawn prior to infilling. Infilling in parts of this area though could have taken place historically. Given the age of these sites, if landfilling did take place there is unlikely to be any containment (such as landfill liners), that could be breached by the proposed developments. This reduces our concerns regarding redevelopment of these sites, but there may still be contamination risks associated with redevelopment. Contamination issues from potential landfilling would still need to be resolved as part of any redevelopment. Furthermore, the previous uses of the John Curtis site and the old coal yard could have resulted in contamination. This would also need to be resolved as part of any redevelopment. In our limited information on the John Curtis site, there is reference to a historic site investigation from 1994 (prior to the formation of the Environment Agency). This refers to contamination being present at the John Curtis site, but no further details are provided. However, none of the sites are located in highly sensitive groundwater areas. The sites are generally located on some river terrace gravels (Secondary aquifer) over Ampthill Clay (unproductive strata). The presence of Secondary aquifers does mean that there may be controlled water receptors that need to be considered as part of the redevelopment of these sites. The most sensitive is likely to be the John Curtis site, as it is located next to Radley Lakes - a sensitive surface waters receptor. We do not anticipate that contamination issues at these sites would preclude development, but such issues would need to be resolved as part of any redevelopment. Given the above, we would recommend that the following sentence/requirement is included about the three potential development sites at the allotments, the John Curtis site and the Old Coal Yard – if the earlier identified flood risk issues can be overcome: “Appropriate measures will need to be taken to remedy any contamination issues or instability from previous land uses”. We recommend referring to “contamination issues” as it is often not feasible to completely remove all contamination.	This is helpful, and the wording has been amended

1		We agree with the proposals	
Environment Agency		The current value of this site should be celebrated in the Neighbourhood Plan as it is used by many protected species including otters and water voles and offers great opportunities for people to engage with their natural environment. The Lakes have a long-term management plan already in place which is a planning condition relating to the restoration of the site and the next plan should be long term and ambitious. On the bullet point: "If the road access is solved there is scope for permanent planning permission for commercial use in the north west of the area, without impacting adversely on the area as a whole;" - this should ideally be removed as this area is a Local Wildlife Site that would be very sensitive to development and the statement is very vague and open to interpretation. The Environment Agency should be included in the list of organisations to be involved in developing a Management Plan. Radley Lakes can be busy and any increased access to this area should be carefully balanced with the needs of biodiversity and existing interests. There are non-native species in the Radley Lakes area, so any increased access should not increase the risk of spread of these species.	
Friends of Radley Lakes		We warmly welcome the Plan's aspirations and strategy for the future of the Radley Lakes area. We believe that, with the right management, the Radley Lakes area could become an exceptional wildlife and recreational area. The 'extractive and industrial' phase of the area's history is now gradually coming to an end. Given this, and given (1) the condition of much of the land (e.g. former fly-ash pits) and (2) its location in the floodplain, both of which largely preclude either agricultural use or development, uses based on nature conservation and quiet recreation are most appropriate for the long-term future of the area. In particular, the diversity of habitats present means that, properly managed, Radley Lakes could become an outstandingly rich wildlife site.	Support noted
Friends of Radley Lakes		CA.9 – we suggest adding, after "conservation and amenity groups", the words "in particular, Friends of Radley Lakes and the Earth Trust". FRL is the only body which is specifically dedicated to the area, while Earth Trust currently leases and manages Thrupp Lake, and is already undertaking management work on other parts of the Lakes area.	The role of FRL and the Earth Trust is recognised. Not appropriate to list everyone in the CA, but the list has been extended in the supporting text
Friends of Radley Lakes		PP.11 – we suggest amending the final sentence as follows: Prompt enforcement action will be taken against unlawful uses or development so that continuation of these is prevented and so that permissions are not created by default.	The substance of this is strongly supported but the Vale have advised that it would not be appropriate for the Planning Policy
Friends of Radley Lakes		PP.12 – we suggest amending the text to read "towards Audlett Drive or Barton Lane". We think that an access from Audlett Drive would be preferable and more achievable, but we think it would be a good idea to keep both options open. The suggested wording also aligns the text of the policy with the legend of Map 5. (We note that, at 4.6.2, Access, the text does refer "access towards Audlett Drive, either directly or via Barton Lane". We think that for clarity it would be best to mention Barton Lane in the policy itself, especially given the way the options are depicted on Map 5.)	Agree that options should be kept open. The particular suggestion has been overtaken by the revised wording.
Friends of Radley Lakes		We support and endorse the comments of Abingdon Naturalists Society (dated 10 February 2017) on the Plan. We are particularly anxious to ensure that the wildlife-rich areas of Orchard Lake and Calfrey's March are protected from future mineral extraction.	See comment on the Abingdon Naturalists Society suggestion
Friends of Radley Lakes		4.6.1 (second paragraph, final sentence) – amend to "no minerals have been extracted since about 2004". (The 'Barton Lane quarry', now known as Longmead Lake, was extracted in the period 1997 to 2004.)	Text has been amended to reflect this

Friends of Radley Lakes		4.6.1 (third paragraph) – the issues mentioned here arose during the period of mineral extraction (not “Since the extraction of minerals”). We suggest amending the wording and section subheadings as follows: “The extraction of minerals has been accompanied by the following: • Unrelated commercial and industrial activity • The emergence of potential for nature conservation and quiet recreation • Significant traffic and access issues, now arising from uses not connected with mineral extraction in the area”	Text has been amended to reflect this
Friends of Radley Lakes		4.6.2, Other industrial and commercial uses (first paragraph) - we suggest amending the wording to “the default position under existing permissions is”. Use of the word ‘default’ suggests that there are one or more other positions under the existing permissions. This is not so – they only require restoration to greenfield.	Text has been amended to reflect this
Friends of Radley Lakes		4.6.2, Other industrial and commercial uses (second paragraph) – we suggest amending the final sentence to “it would be preferable to implement the current planning requirement of return to greenfield” (see previous comment).	
Friends of Radley Lakes		4.6.2, Access – we have some doubts about the proposal to close Thrupp Lane to vehicular traffic (at ‘point 9’ as shown on Map 5). This is for two reasons. First, a number of users of the area do drive further down Thrupp Lane, and along the BOAT on the east side of Thrupp Lake (e.g. fishermen). Second, a significant number of people now travel to the Lakes by car down Thrupp Lane, generally parking in Thrupp Lane at its junction with the BOAT. As there is very little space for safe parking on Thrupp Lane to the north of ‘point 9’, people wishing to access the Lakes by car would (1) be deterred from visiting at all, or (2) be forced to drive round Audlett Drive and gain access via Barton Lane, or (3) park unsafely to the north of ‘point 9’. Some further thought needs to be given to this.	Noted, but little concern has been expressed about the proposed closure
Natural England		Natural England encourages proposals to help improve people’s access to the natural environment, we therefore welcome the aim of policy CA.7 to create an Area of Quiet Recreation and Nature Conservation in the Radley Lakes area. Additionally, we advise that consideration is given to the Thames Path National Trail, including minimising impacts from development and provision of opportunities to improve access. The National Trails website www.nationaltrail.co.uk provides information.	Support noted. The revised text refers explicitly to the Thames Path
8		Radley Lakes Area. We strongly support Policy PP11 and enforcement action against unlawful industrial development. A new access (PP12) to Audlett Drive is essential for safety reasons. The existing derelict building at Thrupp Lake should be demolished as soon as possible as it is becoming increasingly vandalised and will soon become really dangerous.	Support noted. The building has now been demolished.
13		We fully support all of your proposals for this area	Support noted
14		Agree.	
17		No comment	
18		Support. Access to the important employment at the end of Thrupp Lane can very easily be provided to Audlett Drive. Consideration needs to be given to preventing through traffic using this as a short cut but this could be achieved via a traffic barrier near Radley Lakes.	Support noted, and agree that through traffic would be undesirable.

19		Agree	Support noted
20		Agree with RPC strategy.	
23		All supported	
25		Agree- Accessible Natural green space is essential for quality of life, and has tangible benefits in terms of mental and physical health, and in turn economic benefits. Guidance on green space (area and proximity per numbers of residents is provided by the government's statutory nature conservation advisor Natural England, and these should be met as an absolute minimum. Any such policies should be cited in the neighbourhood plan to support this policy.	Support noted. The links with health have been emphasised in the revised text
27		Fully support this - saving the lakes was a wonderful victory that provides a tranquil and beautiful environment - removal of the lorries would be a great further improvement	Support noted
28		As a cyclist, I avoid going down the road to the lakes, unless it is Sunday, because of the danger from lorries, so improvements would be welcome.	The dangers are emphasised in the text
29		Thrupp Lane is dangerous. Cycling or walking is not a pleasant way to traverse the lane. Even by car, it can be treacherous with large lorries unable or willing to give way to oncoming traffic. Support the overall principle and feel more should be done to encourage businesses/ landowners to help provide the solution.	The text recognises the need for dialogue with landowners
31		I have no problem with the status quo. Thrupp Lane is not exactly a busy thoroughfare and occasionally having to let a lorry squeeze by is not a big issue. I would rather keep it as it is, a country lane, and not have heavy wagons trundling down Audlett Drive.	The wider perception of consultees is that the conflict with lorries on Thrupp Lane is a significant problem. Audlett Drive is a much more suitable road for heavy vehicles.
32		Agree	Support noted
33		Agree strongly, Thrupp Lake is a valuable resource. I would prefer to terminate activities on the industrial site, which should never have been allowed in the Green Belt in the first place	Support noted but existing valid planning permissions need to be respected
35		I agree with all aspects of the proposed strategy.	Support noted
36		I support RPC strategy to solve the difficult problem of Thrupp Lane conflicts.	
	PP13 - roads strategy	White's Lane should be redesigned to become the effective Radley through route. There should be a realigned and redesigned junction with Foxborough Road, a diversion to by-pass the houses at the south end of the road, and possibly a smoothing of the bends.	
OCC		Our officers attended a meeting on 19th October 2016 and provided some advice at that stage. We have not been able to review your Roads Strategy or the related Policy 13 within the timeframe for comments, but welcome further discussion with yourselves and District officers.	Discussions have taken place in the context of the planning applications for the strategic housing sites, and the text has been amended to reflect the possibility of solutions which differ from those in the December draft but nevertheless achieve the desired result.

Barton Willmore		Our client’s transport consultants are developing a scheme of improvements at the White’s Lane / Foxborough Road / Thrupp Lane / Radley Road junction, early design iterations of which were presented at the recent public consultation event. Oxfordshire County Council (OCC) Highways have been receptive to the reconfiguration of the junction, with Foxborough Road forming the minor arm of a new priority-controlled junction arrangement. This will reinforce the role of White’s Lane as the through-route and will contribute to improved safety at this intersection. The improvements utilise additional land owned by Radley College to realign White’s Lane and deliver a ‘service road’ that bypasses existing properties, as referred to by RNP. Significant improvements for pedestrians and cyclists are also incorporated into the scheme. Our client resists proposals to smooth the bends on White’s Lane because this would contribute to increased vehicle speeds. The bends perform a speed-limiting role. OCC Highways have communicated a similar view in their discussions with our client’s transport consultants.	Discussions with OCC about the design of the new junction have been reflected in the revised text. The revised text also removes reference to the straightening of the White’s Lane bends
AWE		This Report supports all the Draft NP’s policies and proposals. The new roundabout junction for Whites Lane, Foxborough Road and Thrupp Lane is especially supported but should be a policy proposal. The Radley NW proposals 20 included improvements to this junction, but these are inferior to a roundabout. Radley South could contribute to this improvement, and the saved cost for Radley NW could be spent elsewhere.	Support noted, but the development of the South Radley housing site is not supported by the Local Plan
Jonathan Dockar Drysdale and Theresa Colton, owners of Gooseacre Farm		The development of Radley South would enable the developers of that site and the Radley North West site to pool resources to ensure that the junction with Foxborough Road at the top of Thrupp Lane and the bottom of White’s Lane, is properly designed as a roundabout to ensure a smooth and safe flow of traffic, cyclists and pedestrians from all directions. This is just one example of how the village can benefit from the development of Radley South, by orchestrating the very best solutions for the village from the developers involved.	
Benefice housing group		We endorse the plans (4.7.2) to modify the junction of Whites Lane with Foxborough Rd – and also to create a service road through the new housing development running from Whites Lane in the southwest to Church Rd in the northeast.	Support noted. The proposed design of the Foxborough Road/White’s Lane junction should reduce any risks of Foxborough Road being used as a short cut.
14		Agree. Re. the junction-- A roundabout would be the sensible option but with traffic lights, either all the time or at peak times -- otherwise, the people who actually live in Foxborough Road and its tributaries will be stuck when they wish to leave Radley, as there could be a never-ending stream of traffic coming from Whites Lane, and that traffic would of course have priority. There also needs to be a sign saying that Foxborough Road is for Foxborough Road area / Rail station only (obviously to include Stonhouse etc). Just to say “local” could be construed as pertaining traffic going to the new development. There will be a massive volume of traffic, not just private cars, and it must be discouraged from taking a “short cut”.	
17		No comment	
18		Already the de facto through route; and agreed the current junction is dangerous. Support.	Support noted
19		Agree though traffic calming rather than smoothing that encourages excess speed should be employed. As the road through Kennington already has these features why not through to Radley?	Kennington is not an apt analogy as there is the problem there that the through route is also the village service road. In the central Radley village there is scope to separate these functions
20		We support this.	Support noted

23		The junction needs to be improved but the bends should not be smoothed. Significant traffic calming is required on White's Lane.	The revised text deprioritises the smoothing of the bends.
24		Yes this is vital. Please also consider users of mobility scooters, which are becoming more and more common, and which will increase in number as we baby boomers become older. The pavements along Foxborough Road are not passable for mobile scooters and the road surface is awful for these vulnerable vehicles. A properly thought-out roundabout is essential.	Agreed. The revised text includes a reference to mobility scooters. Supporting amendments have also been made to the next two sections of the draft
25		This is essential. The current layout is high risk for both residents accessing properties and through traffic. The additional traffic from new developments will further exacerbate this problem. The pedestrian crossing point at the southernmost end of whites lane is most dangerously sited, with poor visibility from all approaches, allied with narrow pavements on whites lane in the vicinity of the crossing. I was pleased to hear during consultation meetings that all parties were in agreement regarding the essential nature of the realignment of whites lane. It is essential that the modifications take place prior to construction commencing, as the risks outlined above, plus the fact that HGVs are excluded from this road, would make any other option unacceptable.	Support noted
26		When I discussed the "smoothing" with the Radley College reps at their exhibition, they were adamant that they liked the bends in spite of the danger. They are foolish if they really think people will drive more slowly because of the bends. They thought that straighter roads would encourage speeding! In my opinion, whatever decisions are made regarding the route, there should be adequate means to ensure that people do NOT break the speed limits.	The case for straightening the bends is arguable, and the reference has been removed in the revised text. Agree that the bends should not be relied on to limit speeds
26		Regarding speed limits, I am concerned that people from the housing development in Whites Lane will decide to take an "alternative route" out of Radley, along Foxborough Road, and not use Whites Lane.	It is not thought that that the road and site exit proposals will give any incentive for NW Radley car users residents to go via Foxborough Road unless for local purposes
26		I think that consideration needs to be applied to this issue, and possibly an answer would be to have, firstly, a small amount of "calming" in Church Road, just South of the "New Exit" -- this would not only deter the choice of going past the railway station to exit Radley, but would also cause drivers to start to slow as they approach the school from Church Road. Secondly, to make the whole of Church Road, and the "bendy" part of Foxborough Road, (ie from the bend where the Bowyers is) a 20mph zone. (Although drivers will always transgress speed limits, only a few people are likely to go above 30 in a 20 zone, whereas in a 30 zone quite a lot of people do more like 40.) If drivers from the Housing Development realise that the "railway" way out is a slow one, over the bump and 20 miles an hour, they will hopefully go out along Whites Lane as intended.	
26		Re. "bypass the houses"-- do you mean in Whites Lane? A bit ambiguous here!	Yes and this is clarified in the revised text
27		Agreed - the junction must be a key part of the proposals to enable effective traffic flow	The text has been revised to make it clearer what the revised junction needs to achieve - whether or not it takes the form of a roundabout
28		There needs to be a roundabout at the junction between Foxborough Rd and Whites Lane. At the moment, whenever I come past Whites Lane there are cars waiting there to come out. With the proposed change in the road layout, these cars would have priority over those of us when coming out of Radley, but more importantly when coming from Abingdon, and turning right into Foxborough Rd, we would be waiting to cross the traffic, which is dangerous in itself, but the waiting involved will cause traffic coming from Abingdon to build up behind us . With increased traffic from new houses the situation will be even worse. We need a roundabout to make the junction safer, especially with increased traffic.	
28		Maybe there should also be a crossing from the Foxborough side of Whites Lane to the footpath to Peachcroft. This would also slow down the traffic from Whites Lane.	Agreed and the text has been amended to reflect the importance of this route

29		Agree this is a sensible proposal	Support noted
30		Agree. The current layout for new housing in White's Lane does not show a footpath	
31		I agree. Again "must" not "should". Remember how much profit is being made by those whose interest in spoiling Radley stops at the bank.	
32		Agree	
33		Agree: more important to get the junction right than straighten the bends	The revised text reflects this view on priorities
34		On the Neighbourhood Plan, there is a roundabout where Foxborough Road meets the new diverted Whites Lane. On the Radley College Display it was a T junction. The design guy from Cole Easdon said a T junction kept it more villagey (a roundabout made it more like a town) and he suggested we change the Neighbourhood Plan. I think that's probably a good idea, as long as there are sleeping policemen / road tables to slow down traffic, which he said there would be. Can we change the plan to show a T junction not a roundabout at the bottom of Whites Lane / Foxborough Road / Thrupp Lane ? Thx	Most consultation respondents have favoured a roundabout, but the text has been amended to reflect that other solutions might be acceptable as long as they achieve the desired result.
35		I agree in principle; in practice this seems to be included in the plans for the NW Radley development. In that, the provision for cyclists includes an awkward crossing of the road. I would like this to be re-thought.	The revised text gives greater emphasis to the need for safe crossing by cyclists
36		There should be roundabout here to act as a traffic calming measure which will complement the one suggested for Sugworth Lane.	See response to other comments. The revised text acknowledges that a roundabout might not be the only means of achieving the desired effect
	PP13, CA10	A new access road should be created for industrial and commercial traffic currently using Thrupp Lane, connecting to Audlett Drive. Thrupp Lane should then be closed to vehicular traffic at a point south of Home Farm, rendering it safe for cyclists and walkers.	
Jonathan Dockar Drysdale and Theresa Colton, owners of Gooseacre Farm		We have no objection to the vision of extending Thrupp Lane through to Audlett Drive, subject to the approval of the landowners over whose land any such road will have to pass. Certainly, the development of Radley South will enable a far more holistic approach to the design of HGV, car, cycle and pedestrian routes through the village. The closure of Thrupp Lane to HGV traffic will serve to improve safety along this particular route. This can be achieved by traffic calming and road narrowing measures. However, to close it entirely will be to deny Radley residents the opportunity to use this new additional route to access Abingdon. This may be important once traffic numbers increase along Foxborough Road, as they inevitably will with the creation of the proposed Park & Ride facility at Lodge Hill. It is worth noting that any such scheme will be very expensive to implement. The recommended small scale development of the Old Coal Yard can hardly be expected to generate the public funds necessary for such a scheme. The development of Radley South may well be critical to assist in this regard.	Support noted, but RPC do not consider it desirable for Thrupp Lane to become a through route for cars going from the village to Audlett Drive, as this would negate the aim of making it safe for cyclists and pedestrians. Nor does RPC accept that its strategy for Thrupp Lane requires the development of the South Radley housing site.
17		No comment	

18		Strongly agree. Road should then be resurfaced and repaired; potholes currently make it hazardous to cyclists.	Support noted	
19		Agree		
20		Agree.		
23		Supported		
24		Yes, taking the lorries onto a new road from Thrupp Lane would be an excellent idea. They seem to be increasing in number.		
25		Yes- this is essential such that the amenity value of Thrupp lake and its environs can be safely accessed, and fully realised.		
26		Yes		
27		Agreed and the impact of this would be minimal on Audlett Drive traffic which is already quite substantial		
28		Yes, make it a safer area and a place for people from the bigger Radley and Abingdon to use in peace.		
29		This ought to be mandatory as part of the Vale overall plan.		
30		Agree		
31		I disagree.		Opposition noted - but a minority view
32		Extremely important		Support noted
33		Strongly agree		
35		I agree.		
36		I fully support this.		

	PP13 - roads strategy	On the Kennington Road, there should be a new pedestrian crossing between the South Kennington housing site and the Pebble Hill mobile home site and a new four-way junction with exits to Sugworth Lane and the housing site entrance, designed to slow the pace of through traffic.	
Pegasus for Redrow		A significant amount of detailed technical work has already been undertaken by my client in order to secure the allocation of the South Kennington site. This work included instructing a Highways Consultant to devise a site access strategy and to assess the likely impact of any development on the highways network. Both strands of work undertaken to date have been informed by discussions with Oxfordshire County Council’s Highways Department . To this end, my client was able to display a Concept Masterplan at the recent public exhibition which illustrated a robust site access strategy. This strategy comprises the delivery of two new priority T-Junctions at either end of the site fronting Kennington Road. As part of the access strategy we are seeking to reinforce the introduction of a 30 mph speed limit just to the south of Sugworth Lane/Kennington Road junction. In addition to the two new vehicular access points, the Public Right of Way running north to south through the site will be retained and upgraded as part of any development.	The text has been revised to recognise that there might be acceptable solutions other than the roundabout previously proposed
		My client and their Highways Consultant has considered the strategy put forward through the RNP and can confirm the following:• The provision of a new pedestrian crossing between the South Kennington housing site and Pebble Hill mobile park will be fully investigated. Indeed, we recognise the importance of providing a safe pedestrian crossing on Kennington Road. The details and location of any pedestrian crossing will be included in the forthcoming planning application; and • Utilising a new four-way junction at the end of Sugworth Lane to comprise the access to the South Kennington site is not an option my client is able to deliver. As explained earlier in this letter the optimum site access strategy, which has been drawn up in the knowledge of the relevant highways authorities, is to provide two vehicular access points directly off Kennington Road. Utilising a new junction at the end of Sugworth Lane to serve as a vehicular access to the South Kennington site, as depicted on Map 7 (point B), relies on the use of land outside of the site’s allocation boundary, which remains in the Green Belt. Accordingly, in planning terms the land required to deliver this option remains highly constrained and is not a viable option at this time.	
Benefice housing group		Kennington Road often suffers congestion or completely grinds to a halt – sometimes due to too many parked cars; sometimes due to stress on associated routes; sometimes due to school parking or waste-disposal vehicles. This pressure will only increase with a 20% increase in the urban area of the village. It is also of note that the surface of Kennington Road and The Avenue are in dire need of re-surfacing and it would be extremely beneficial if re-surfacing could take place prior to the commencement of building works. We believe that it is essential that the issue of pressure on Kennington’s roads is addressed in the discussions between Radley Parish Council and Kennington Parish Council.	The revised text reflects discussions with the developer and OCC in which the Benefice Group have been involved.
17		Agree and would suggest that the four-way junction includes a mini round-about	

19		Agree	These comments mostly support what was proposed, which RPC welcome. However the revised text places greater emphasis on what needs to be achieved, including on traffic calming, rather than on precise design solutions.
20		Agree.	
23		Supported	
24		Yes, ditto my answer above. The roundabout needs to be properly thought out for all road users, including mobility scooters, especially in view of the inevitable increase in traffic from an improved junction with the A34.	
25		Yes- strongly support the provision of pedestrian provision wherever it is needed.	
26		Probably a good idea. Please remember to destroy as little of the environment as is possible.	
27		Yes - this is sensible for a safety perspective	
29		No comment	
30		Traffic calming measures will be required	
31		Not sure I agree. Whatever happens traffic flow will be severely curtailed.	
32		Agree	
33		Agree	
35		No opinion.	
36		I agree.	
	PP13 - roads strategy	Traffic calming measures on Sugworth Lane should be introduced to deter dangerous rat-running likely to be generated by the proposed diamond junction and Park & Ride site at Lodge Hill.	
Barton Willmore		This remark acknowledges the important role that Sugworth Lane will play in accommodating some local traffic movements towards the proposed diamond junction and Park & Ride site. Future residents of the North West Radley allocation and, indeed, existing residents of Radley are likely to make increased use of this route. It is understood that OCC Highways are looking at such 'ratrunning' and it may be that contributions are payable from the North West Radley and South Kennington allocations towards traffic management measures. We point out, however, that the perception of Sugworth Lane as experiencing 'dangerous rat running' is not necessarily evidenced by accident records, and respectfully suggest that the terminology is amended. Only two accidents have been recorded along Sugworth Lane over the five-year period to November 2016.	The draft plan did not in fact say there was 'dangerous' rat-running, but spoke of the need to deter it. The precise wording has anyway been amended.

Benefice housing group		We appreciate the idea tabled in point 4.7.2 of the RNP to install a roundabout where Sugworth lane joins Kennington Rd. However, we believe that this alone will not address the fundamental challenge presented by the combination of the new South Kennington housing development and the newly enhanced junction of the A34 to the west. Far more robust measures will be required (such as bollarding or limiting flow direction at certain times of day) if this route is not to become a dangerous rat-run. If traffic is to substantially increase on this road, it may be necessary to provide an alternative route for pedestrians/cyclists who no longer feel safe on this route.	Most of these comments agree that Sugworth Lane traffic is a problem which risks becoming worse. There is general, but not unanimous, support for traffic calming. The revised text gives greater emphasis to the need for solutions and for these to be pursued in the context of the South Kennington housing development. RPC's view remains that calming will be more appropriate than measures to close the Lane to through traffic or to make it more easily used by through traffic. However, the detailed design on calming solutions needs further consideration and it is not appropriate for the NP to address this.
2		Ref Sugworth Lane. Must be made wider and straighter to take the increase of traffic in both directions with property speed restrictions for safety of the people living along the lane.	
10		I support traffic calming on Sugworth Lane.	
14		Yes	
17		Sugworth Lane should have speed (30mph) and weight limit.	
18		I cannot see how Sugworth Lane can be more hostile to vehicles than it already is. Do not support.	
19		agree	
20		Agree	
23		Sugworth Lane is a logical route to the A34. Redevelopment of Sugworth Lane may be required as part of the A34 access changes	
24		Please ensure traffic calming doesn't make the road difficult for other users.	
25		Agree	See response above
26		Yes	
27		Agreed	
28		The road is dangerous enough already, so any improvement would be welcome.	
29		No comment	
30		Sugworth Lane is extremely busy and dangerous at the beginning and end of term time with parents collecting students using this route	
31		There will be so much extra traffic after the building that speeding is unlikely to be possible.	
32		Agree	
33		Agree	
35		The diamond junction appears to be an illusory aspiration.	
36		I agree.	

	PP13 - roads strategy	Resurfacing the road carrying the 35 bus route through Radley and Kennington should be a priority.	
14		Yes	The text has been amended to emphasise that the road surface is an issue for all road users. The reference to the bus route has however been retained as it is normally accepted that greater priority should be given to premium bus routes. In practice, however, this is not primarily a NP issue, nor can it be resolved through discussion on the strategic housing sites - developers cannot be required to pay for maintenance. It is more an issue for the parish councils to pursue on an ongoing basis with the county council.
17		Agreed - double yellow lines needed through Kennington to ease congestion.	
18		Support - for the sake of cyclists.	
19		why? less of an issue for buses than cycles/cars?	
20		Absolutely agree.	
23		Not sure why this is a priority.	
24		YES! This should be done as a matter of urgency.	
25		Yes, but not just in terms of the bus, the surface is dangerous for cyclists, which is a key issue given the high volume of cycle traffic, and the status of the route as national cycleway 5.	
26		It needs doing but priorities are relative-- it depends what else might be a "priority".	
27		Agreed - this has suffered recently and is not a suitable thoroughfare at present.	
28		Yes, as a cyclist I can say the road is in a terrible state and is dangerous because cyclists have to avoid the rough areas where it has been patched many times, especially in cold and wet weather. There is the danger of falling off or the bike sliding away below one if you keep to the edge of the road and if you move out to avoid the rough surfaces you run the risk of being hit from front or behind. Also, if you keep to the rough area the risk of falling off has the additional danger of being run over by a car behind you.	
29		Currently it is a very painful bus ride for those people with arthritis and disability. Support this proposal	
31		Good luck. The state of the road is currently a disgrace. The repair works along Foxborough Road are already disintegrating.	
32		Definitely	
33		Agree	
34		And please resurface the old Whites Lane which is due to be cut off and turned into a cul de sac. Thx	
35		I agree, especially repairing potholes that can upset cyclists.	
36		This should be a priority without the NP!	
			See response to related comments from respondents 14-28 above

	PP14, CA 11	RPC should work with Sustrans and landowners to improve Sustrans Route 5 across the parish.	
OCC		Caution should be exercised with proposals for new cycle / pedestrian routes across fields – these are normally only possible with a co-operative landowner, who either needs to dedicate rights or sell required land.	The need for landowner agreement is accepted, but in some cases the land is in the same ownership as the related housing development. The text has been amended to bring this out.
OCC		Routes towards Oxford: We agree with the suggestion that Sustrans NCN route 5 should go through the South Kennington development site (map 8, B). While the route parallel to the railway has benefit (map 8, A), particularly for Radley village itself, there are likely other priorities for the County Council given the existing roadside route	Support noted. Further discussion with OCC is taking place in the context of the South Kennington housing site, and it is hoped that acceptable basis can be found for a new track between the site and the station
OCC		Routes towards Abingdon: The unsatisfactory situation on Thrupp Lane created by HGVs is noted and the County Council would like to see a satisfactory resolution to the problem.	Support noted.
OCC		While the Thrupp Lane route is designated as part of the National Cycle Network, connecting Radley to Abingdon and beyond, other routes to Abingdon should not be overlooked – particularly via White’s Lane, possibly Path 8 and then Audlett Drive or Radley Road. With Radley Road traffic calmed and Audlett Drive benefitting from off-carriageway cycle provision throughout, these routes are important options for journeys to Abingdon from both the existing village and development site. A journey to Abingdon from the White’s Lane / Church Road junction is in the region of 2km shorter via White’s Lane, Path 8 and Radley Road than the equivalent Sustrans route 5. The North West Radley development should fund improvements to the route along White’s Lane and Path 8 as part of North West Radley development, for example by better integrating Path 8 at the Radley end, either to the carriageway or by extending it further along White Road – perhaps integrating it with provision in the development site, and with provision of some form of lighting, to create a fully lit route to Abingdon.	These are helpful points and further discussion with OCC is taking place in the context of the planning applications for the three housing sites. The text has been amended to reflect the latest position.
OCC		While the above in no way seeks to lessen the issue with Thrupp Lane, equally, the Thrupp Lane situation should not overshadow useful improvements on other routes.	
Jonathan Dockar Drysdale and Theresa Colton, owners of Gooseacre Farm		Agreed. The development of Radley South would open up a whole range of possibilities for the implementation of a safe and improved Sustrans Route 5 through the village and on down Thrupp Lane to the River Thames.	Noted, but the development of the South Radley site is not supported in the Local Plan

Benefice housing group		We strongly endorse the plan tabled under point 4.8.2 (plan A) to install a cycle route along the west side of the railway between Sandford Lane and Radley Railway Station. Though there is officially a cycle path on the west side of Kennington Rd between Kennington and Radley, many cyclists (especially south bound) do not use it, either because it is too narrow or perceived to be only for northbound cyclists – and hence this road becomes very dangerous during the morning and evening commute. This issue has been exacerbated by the failure of the Oxford-Abingdon off-road cycle route south of Sandford Lane.	Support noted, and further detailed discussion - in which the Benefice Group is involved - is taking place in the context of the South Kennington housing site
Ditto		We endorse the RNP's proposal to install a cycle route on, or near to, the route of the current footpath from the railway bridge on Sandford Lane to the junction of Sugworth Lane with Kennington Rd. It is important that this estate has pedestrian and foot access to Kennington Rd and Sandford Lane.	
14		Yes. There needs to be more emphasis in the plan to suggest and promote more strongly cycle routes through the new developments and village	Believe the emphasis is already strong
17		No comment	
18		Agree; the current route from Sandford Lane to Kennington is unsuitable as a cycle route due to poor surface, narrow pathway and conflict with pedestrians. Most cyclists use the road, rejoining Route 5 at Redbridge. This should be the default route and improvements made.	This is noted, but use of the current Sustrans route north of Sandford Lane is significant and there is a need to ensure that the track is properly maintained
19		agree but unclear whether/how much it is/will be used - cost benefit tbc?	Support noted
20		Agree.	
23		Supported	
24		Yes please.	
25		Strongly agree. Cycling is key to solving many transport social, health and environmental ills. Given traffic growth sustainable cycle solutions need to be adopted. These need to be mainstream and ambitious and meet the genuine popular desire for people to cycle.	
26		yes	
27		Yes - the bicycle route from Thrupp Lane is excellent and should be extended.	RPC consider that considerable improvement is needed
28		It is not looked after, so has been getting narrower and slippery. There should a cycle lane from Kennington as the hill means that cyclists slow down and get in the way of traffic.	See response to comment from respondent number 18
29		I support this aspiration but believe that most cyclists prefer to use the roads rather than cycle ways.	The revised text emphasises the need to make the tracks more attractive to cyclists

30		A report on RPC website mentions proposed footpath/cycleway through Selwyn Crescent, there is no available gap anywhere in this road. Important RPC keeps residents informed about any proposals in future about new footpath/cycleway in future	RPC continue to believe that there should be pedestrian and cycle link from the North West Radley housing site towards the station. The draft plan does not propose a specific location for this link which would be for discussion with the developers and needs to involve residents.
31		No comment.	
32		Agree	Support noted
33		Strongly agree; Radley should be embarrassed that it is still one of the gaps in the C5 London to Birmingham cycle route	
35		I agree.	
36		I agree.	
	PP14 - cycle and walking strategy	Path 8 from White's Lane to Twelve Acre Drive should be improved.	
Barton Willmore		This facility provides an important connection between Radley and Abingdon and our client agrees that this route should be upgraded and formalised so that cyclists may 'legitimately' use it. This proposal will form part of the transport mitigation package for the NW Radley development.	Support noted
14		Yes	
17		Agreed	
18		Agreed; main problems are at the two ends and changes to the White's Lane/Foxborough Road junction will help.	
19		agree	
20		Agree.	
23		Supported	
24		It is vital that this and all cycle tracks should be lit. The argument that it would lead to concerns re urban connections with Abingdon do not hold. Cyclists will not use the track if it isn't lit when it is dark. They/we don't use it now. I have tried once or twice and it is pitch black and impossible to see oncoming pedestrians even with a headlight. During the winter months it is dark at 4.30pm and so will affect schoolchildren who are cycling to school.	There are differing views about the desirability of lighting, which add to capital and maintenance costs as well as risking an urbanised feel. The revised text continues to treat this as something for review rather than a necessity.

25		Agree. See comments re pedestrian crossing at the bottom of whites lane. This is also a problem lists, and cyclists need to be catered for in the redesign.	All these points are agreed. The response to comment from respondent number 24 is relevant
26		Yes but please do not destroy the wild areas.	
27		Yes - as long as it doesn't become seen as a link route to Abingdon that removes the feel of being a village	
29		I support this aspiration but again consider that most cyclists will use the roads rather than cycle track	There is scope to increase use of Path 8 through design of the White's lane/Foxborough Road junction, and this gets greater emphasis in the revised text
30		Is this the same as above ?	Not understood
31		I think it would be better to encourage cyclists to use this path; signing perhaps?	See response to respondent 29
32		Agree	Support noted
33		Agree	
35		I agree.	
36		This should be 3m wide segregated cycle/pedestrian route.	There are differing views on whether segregation is desirable. Arguably it is not necessary if the width is adequate.
	PP14 -cycle and walking strategy	A new cycle track should be established through from the North Abingdon strategic site to Radley centre to facilitate access to the station and the new sports facilities proposed west of Peachcroft Farm.	
Radley College		We believe investment in "Path 8" and the proposed Whites Lane Road improvements as part of the North West Radley development will significantly improve Radley/Abingdon pedestrian and cycle access. We are very uncomfortable with the proposal to site a cycle path across a working farm (which would also have no lighting) - and an analysis of distances to the station may show a marginal gain at best. It would seem better to reserve this aspiration for another day, and review after the existing planned developments and improvements take place with what would then be a wider population.	Support for Path 8 improvements is welcome. RPC continue to believe that a new cycletrack from the North Abingdon site towards the station has strong merit, but the text has been amended to allow for different views as to the best route.
Barton Willmore		The alignment of such a cycle track would entail use of our client's land. The land currently has other demands upon it. Whilst such a connection may be of some benefit to future residents of the North Abingdon strategic allocation and adjacent suburbs, the greatest draw for future residents of the North West Radley allocation and, we contend, for the majority of existing Radley residents is south-westwards towards Abingdon town centre. Travel in this direction will be satisfied by the proposed upgrade of Path 8, as discussed above. The benefit of a connection towards the North Abingdon strategic allocation would, anyway, be somewhat limited by the absence of a direct connection into the centre of Radley by virtue of the private properties forming the western edge of the village's existing built form.	This assessment of the main cycle 'draws' is not supported by the detailed surveys undertaken by RPC for the NP. The main peaktime draw from and through Radley is towards Oxford not Abingdon and there is also significant peak movement from the North Abingdon area to Radley station.

Jonathan Dockar Drysdale and Theresa Colton, owners of Gooseacre Farm		We believe that the release of Radley South from the Green Belt and its subsequent development will enable RPC to develop its central allotment site. It will also ensure that Radley retains its own modern sports facilities close to home. It will thus reduce the need for Radley residents to travel further afield, by car or on cycle, to make use of retail or sports facilities in Abingdon or elsewhere. In this and other ways the development of Radley South will help to provide the funds and the space to reinforce community cohesion rather than threaten it.	Noted, but the site is in the Green Belt and the NP does not support its development
14		Yes	Support noted
17		Agreed	
18		Possibly. However I will believe the new sports facilities when I see them.	Noted
19		agree	Support noted
20		Agree.	
23		Supported	
24		Yes, cycle track improvements please.	
25		Yes- this is essential to enable sustainable access to the strategically significant Radley rail link. Excellent cycle storage facilities at Radley station are also required, including bike boxes, to cater for the increasing use of high value bikes, which open storage is not adequate for.	
26		yes	
29		I support this aspiration but again believe that most cyclists prefer to use the roads rather than cycle tracks	The proposals in the revised NP lay greater emphasis on track design that will result in fewer cyclists opting for the road instead
30		As above	
31		Route?	Support noted and the practicalities recognised
32		Agree	
33		Agree	
35		Welcome in principle, but it does not look practicable to create a direct route.	
36		I fully support this!	

	PP14 -cycle and walking strategy	There should be general improvements to cycleways and pavements and provision for secure cycle storage.	
OCC		The OCC Countryside Access Team (Public Rights of Way) would support the aspirations of the Radley Cycling and Walking Strategy within Chapter 4 of the Neighbourhood Plan as it meets the aims of the adopted Rights of Way Management Plan 2015-2025. If landowner permission for potential improvements to public rights of way and appropriate funding are obtained then the team would be happy to work with the community to plan and achieve improvements on the ground.	Support noted
Barton Willmore		The proposed White's Lane realignment forming part of the transport mitigation package for the North West Radley allocation, described earlier, includes new lengths of adjacent cycleway provision. The opportunity has also been taken to continue this provision via a segregated footway/cycleway around the north-western perimeter of the NW Radley site allocation, as illustrated at the recent public consultation event. Increased cycle parking will also be proposed at the railway station, subject to Network Rail approval and a suitable delivery mechanism being available, and cycle parking will need to be provided for each new dwelling in accordance with Oxfordshire County Council's prevailing standards.	These proposals have been reflected in the revised version of the plan
10		We need a cycle path on Kennington Road from Park End, and along Whites Lane to Thrupp Lane. Cycling on White's Lane is particularly hazardous due to the speed of some cars.	The North West Radley development will result in improvements to cycling along this route and this is reflected in the revised text
10		Cyclists need to be encouraged to use the cycle path from Thrupp Lane along the edge of the field to the roundabout at Audlett Drive.	Agreed and the revised text gives greater emphasis to this
13		We support the majority of your proposals but would like to see specific plans to ensure safe road crossings for children leaving the village to go to local secondary schools. Currently children are taking their life in their hands to cross the Abingdon ring road safely, and this will only get more dangerous with increased volumes of traffic. We would like to see lighting installed on any new cycle tracks so it's safe for all.	The current proposals stemming from the strategic housing sites and contained in the revised NP should result in improved crossings. RPC believe the case for lighting is not clear cut, and this is reflected in the revised text.
14		Yes. There needs to be specific proposals for improving both cycle and pathway to the current school site. In addition to improve road layout and safety around carpark and school access area. It is very dangerous.	Agree that safe cycle and walking arrangements near the school are important. In particular there needs to be safe road crossing between the North West Radley site and the school. The detail of this is currently being considered in the context of the North West Radley housing site
17		Agreed	Support noted
19		agree but where is secure storage required?	
20		Agree.	
24		Yes, yes yes!	
25		Yes, yes, and yes! See previous comments	

26		yes... But beware of the suggestion that the man from Radley College mentioned to me -- he said to put a pedestrian footpath from the church car park to the school, on the church side of the road! (and add a ped Xing at the school).	See response to respondent 14
		While it would be a very good idea to have a ped Xing at the school, a path on the school side of the road would not be very feasible without horrible destruction of our established village pond, and in any case would be SUPERFLUOUS, since if there is a crossing outside the school for people walking up from the new development (and others) they will not need to cross until they get to the school.	
		Re. walking from the car park: one does not even need to go into the road as the footpath, as we all know, goes from the car park into the school!	
28		Safe cycle storage is imperative, as people do not want to risk their bikes disappearing, probably uninsured. I only stop where there is safety for my bike.	Noted
29		I would rather see the pot holes mended	RPC do not consider that one should be at the expense of the other
31		I agree. It would help if people living on the west side of Foxborough Road were to keep their hedges cut back and to discourage visitors from parking on the pavement.	Noted
32		Agree	Support noted
33		Agree	
35		I agree.	
36		There should be a couple of cycle stands at the village shop for customers and volunteers. Perhaps CIL money/ developer could pay for this.	This suggestion is noted

	PP15	PP15: In order to bind the old and new communities together, the NP emphasises the importance of foot and cycle access from the new housing that faces inward towards village facilities and amenities. PP15 requires such provision at the strategic sites.	
Barton Willmore		Our client supports this statement.	This support is noted
Benefice Housing Group		We resonate with the concerns raised regarding Village Connectivity under point 4.9 of the Neighbourhood Plan, but would go further than the proposals tabled under 4.9.2 to also strongly advocate for a cycle/pedestrian access route which would directly link the new housing zone with the station/shop/pub – without the need to detour onto Foxborough Rd or Church Rd. We believe that without this link, the cohesion of the village would be compromised.	
Radley Village Shop		We believe it should be made as easy as possible for the residents of the new houses on the North West Radley site to access the centre of the village, thus encouraging them to use the facilities there, including Radley Village Shop. We feel there is a high chance that residents of the North West Radley site exiting it by car onto Whites Lane are just as likely to drive to Budgens at Peachcroft or, if exiting by car into Church Road, to drive to the new shop on the South Kennington site than to drive to the village centre to visit Radley Village Shop. Having good access to the village centre and thus encouraging the new residents of Radley to use Radley Village Shop is particularly important should the shop move to larger premises and require increased footfall and spend to be profitable.	
2		Access from the new NW development to the school and church will be very important. As well as pedestrian/cycle access onto Church Road car access will also be necessary. The distance of many houses at the top left of the NW development from the school will mean that some will want to use their cars to go to the school as will older people to church.	The December consultation draft did not rule out car access to Church Road, nor does the revised text. There are however potential concerns about safety as the access would be into a narrow road opposite the school carpark.
14		Yes as long as this does not impact on current developments in relation to noise or antisocial behaviour. No consideration should be given for a 'breakthrough' road from existing and new developments	This is noted, but it is generally regarded as good planning practice to integrate communities rather than separate them and this is the policy in the Local Plan
17		Agree	This support is noted
18		Support	
19		agree	
20		Pathways & cycleways should not create a nuisance problem to existing properties.	See response to respondent 14
23		This bears no relation to PP15 in the consultation draft. Vehicle access to the NW Radley site does not have to be limited to White's Lane. Vehicle access to Church Road is important.	See response to respondent 2

24		Yes this is good for the environment and for health.	This support is noted
25		Yes, conduits on the inside, which focus residents inwards is essential.	
26		yes more foot and cycle. make it disabled-friendly.	
27		Absolutely correct	
29		Support this aspiration	
30		See my comments above	
31		Rhetoric.	This support is noted
32		Agree	
33		Strongly agree; there should be a link at the SE of the new development, but this will require some land to be acquired from an existing householder	
35		I agree.	
36		I agree with this.	
	CA12	CA.12 commits RPC to support measures to restrict on-road parking outside Radley station, to extend off-street parking especially secure bike storage, to provide step free access to the up-line and to provide a ticket machine.	
Jonathan Dockar Drysdale and Theresa Colton, owners of Gooseacre Farm		It is particularly significant that development of the Radley South site will not add a single vehicle to the on or off road parking problems at Radley Station. Subject to agreement with Railtrack, the Radley South site even offers a direct route through to the railway station platform without having to go on to a public highway. The site is within easy walking distance of the railway station, as well as The Bowyers Arms and the central allotment site proposed as the village hub. It is certainly much closer than the Peachcroft or South Kennington sites which have been allocated in Part 1 of the Local Plan. The sustainable nature of the Radley South site is hard to ignore. It is simply incomprehensible, therefore, that it is not even mentioned in the draft NP.	Noted, but development of the South Radley site, which is in Green Belt, is not supported by the Local Plan
Benefice housing group		We endorse the plan to increase the capacity of bike storage at Radley Railway Station (point 4.10.2) and would extend this ambition to bike parking at Radley Village Hall.	Support noted, as is the point about the village hall
2		Strongly support this because the new housing in Radley and all the surrounding area will greatly increase the use of the station. Should we also be pressing the rail authorities to extend the station car park as well?	The practical scope to extend the carpark is limited

3		Ref Step free access to upline via Shaws Copse. After consulting with the landowner and residents of Shaws Copse there will not be an agreement to this proposal for the following reasons. 1) Shaws Copse is a private road maintained by the residents and land owner (funding for heavy weather). 2) it is a single track road unlit and no pathway so unsuitable for a higher volume of pedestrian, cycle or motor traffic, there would also be an insurance issue. 3) With the greatest respect inconsiderate parking has not been adequately solved, who would therefore police parking of cars and cycles and unloading so that it would not affect residents services and guests 4) Allowing access would devalue our properties and the sense of privacy and security would disappear. It would no longer be safe for our children and grandchildren to play in our quiet road not to mention the safety issue with an open gate onto a busy electrified rail line. 5) Oxford and Didcot rail stations which are 8.8 and 11 miles approx away already have disabled facilities already, not far to go then. 6) Over the years we hear the phrase Shaws Copse was the original station entrance, which to most implies that it should be open again. What you must remember at that time no residential properties existed there. For twenty seven years the land, the bellmouth and the land at the bottom have been considered by us the residents as our front garden our driveway and our private nature reserve. With that in mind surly it is time to discount Access via Shaws Copse as a cheap way to do it and obtain funding from developers, Network Rail and other interested parties For alternative ways such as a lift.	RPC believe that access via Shaw's Copse is the most practical solution, but the December draft recognised this is a private road and could not be pursued without the agreement of the owner and residents. On the basis of the consultation this seems unlikely to be forthcoming and the text has accordingly been amended.
4		I object in the strongest possible terms to the suggestion of making an access to the station via private land, namely Shaws Copse	
5		Strongly object to the idea of access to the station platform via private land (Shaws copse) if the demand for this is to large then this should be addressed via current station access by Network Rail.	
6		? Do you mean to London? Let's hope so.	Yes
10		I agree with the need for additional car parking and bike storage at Radley Station. I don't think there would be a good business case for a lift. Also I think a ticket machine isn't necessary. Season ticket holders and other passengers can buy tickets on the train or at their destination.	Comments noted
14		Yes	Support noted
15		Current access to the station does not cater well for the disabled or even those who are just not good with steps. Particularly the up line.	
17		Agree	
18		Support although I think some of this is unlikely to be achieved. I note you do not propose to lobby for free parking at the station to return which would be the best solution.	Free parking would help reduce on-road parking near the station but would generate more car use and traffic
19		See CA3 - parking and station facilities to be part of shop/hall/pub development??	This is a potentially attractive proposal but the owners of the pub have not been willing to make their land available as a site for the shop
20		Agree, but extending the yellow lining that exists may only serve to move the parking problem into other side roads that have no restrictions.	The extent of yellow lining will be reviewed in the light of experience

21		I understand that the Plans preferred solution here is with regards to access via Shaw's Copse. As a resident in Shaw's Copse I would strongly object to this solution. Having recently moved into this area a prime charge for the private road would have been made within the purchase price for our property, paid willingly for the option, but one that would be very strongly protected.	See response to respondents 3 and 4
22		The proposed solution for this involving access via Shaw's Copse would be strongly objected to. The land and access being discussed here is private and not for sale. Properties brought in this area were paid for at a premium due to the very nature of a private access and as a current resident I would fight to keep the set up this way. The solution to access to the up line is the responsibility of British Rail to their customers.	
23		Supported	These comments are supportive of the solutions proposed
24		A ticket machine as soon as possible please.	
25		Parking should be disincenticised to encourage pedestrian and cycle access. Access on the east side is a real issue, as is the absence of a ticket machine. Absence of a ticket machine often requires purchase of ticket on arrival in Paddington, which is an inconvenience and delay- particularly when time is tight (transfer time at Didcot often precludes purchase at Didcot).	
26		Please do not extend any solution which increases the on-road parking in the area around the station entrance. It is dangerous enough already.	
27		Bike storage--liaise with pub?	It should be practical to secure extra bike storage on the station itself
		access to up-line-- definitely. make it disabled -friendly.	Support noted
		Please do not extend any solution which increases the on-road parking in the area around the station entrance. It is dangerous enough already.	See response to respondent 18
		Bike storage--liaise with pub?	
		access to up-line-- definitely. make it disabled -friendly.	Support noted
		ticket machine- ok.	
28		Good idea, as there will be more residents to use the station. Indeed, the fact that there is a station will encourage people to move to Radley, so they can use the station, thus increasing the demand placed upon it.	
29		I support this in principle. Step Free access to the London Bound Platform should not be provided at the expense and inconvenience of the residents of Shaw's Copse.	See response to respondents 3 and 4
30		On going problems needs monitoring	
31		No comment.	

32		Agree, especially step free access to the up line.	Support noted and agreed that step free access is a challenge
33		Agree	
35		I agree, while noting that a ticket machine is probably a matter solely for the commercial judgment of Great Western Railway.	
36		I fully support this. Step free access is a very challenging objective.	
	PP16	PP.16 requires developers of the strategic housing sites to contribute to the costs of these measures.	
Barton Willmore		Again, contributions will be made via CIL and S106 as appropriate and in accordance with the Local Plan. Should the proposed measures prove desirable and necessary, consideration should be given funding their implementation via the increased CIL payments the Parish will receive if the RNP is adopted.	Discussions are taking place in the context of the planning applications from strategic housing sites and it is expected that S106 contributions will be secured, especially for increased cycle storage
14		Yes	Support noted
17		Agree	
19		hmmm... smacks of bribery! Why not require them to be included in the development plans?	It is normal planning practice to seek contributions from developers to mitigate the transport impacts of their developments
20		Agree & the train company should also contribute.	Support noted
23		Supported	
25		Good.	
26		Yes yes and yes again.	
27		The developers should be held accountable for the delta of any costs above any council funding of the required improvements to local infrastructure	
28		Only fair, considering the profit they are going to make. If they build houses the environment should be safe and provide the facilities residents need.	See response to respondent 19
29		Any cost contribution needs to come with iron clad guarantees from developers who might happily wriggle out of responsibilities if sufficient safeguarding is not applied to planning permissions. What will happen if the Vale becomes part of the Unitary Authority and planning permissions granted become lost - like they did under Berkshire County Council when the boundary was moved.	
31		As long as G.W.R. pays the rest.	Costs which do not fall to the developers would fall to GWR and/or Network Rail
32		Definitely	Support noted
33		Agree	
35		I agree.	

36		and actually implement these measures under contract to Network Rail where appropriate.	See response to respondent 31
	PP. 17	PP.17 requires that the development sites should incorporate Sustainable Urban Drainage (SUDs), or similar measures so that run-off is no greater than from greenfield sites.	
Thames Water		We propose the below amendments which will make this section of the policy more robust; “Development will be permitted where it is demonstrated that surface water drainage will not add to the existing site run-off or cause any adverse impact to neighbouring properties and the surrounding environment. Sites should incorporate Sustainable Urban Drainage (SUDs), with run-off rates no greater than greenfield sites. SUDs where possible should be designed so as to contribute towards the landscaping and biodiversity of the sites and provision should be made for their future maintenance.	The text has been amended accordingly
14		Agree. These should be developed into aesthetic or recreational amenities (i.e. ponds and streams)	Support noted
17		Very concerned about the knock-on effect of these developments on flooding of the area including the railway.	The proposed policy is designed to prevent this
18		Support	Support noted
19		agree though ‘sustainable’ is an ill defined term with no definitive meaning!	Sustainable Urban Drainage is technical term with a reasonably precise meaning
20		The installation of lagoon/hydrobrake drainage technology should be seen as vital on the NW Radley site due to the run off of water to the ditch adjacent to the back of Ferny Close.	Support noted
23		Supported	
25		Yes, and I think that’s is a statutory planning requirement.	
26		DEFINITELY. And landscape it in a suitable way for nature.	
27		Agreed	
29		Radley suffers the effects of underground springs . Development should take account of groundwater movement and measures taken to ensure flooding does no occur in lower lying land in the village.	See response to respondent 17
30		Need to protect existing properties in Ferny Close and Selwyn Crescent from future flooding.	
31		Surely this is a question for higher authorities than the Parish Council.	The policy in the Neighbourhood Plan is consistent with the policies of the Vale’s Local Plan and designed to re-enforce it.
32		Agree	Support noted
33		Agree	
35		I agree.	
36		I agree.	

	PP18	PP.18 requires that there should be a Drainage Survey and Report covering the whole area served by the outfall sewer from each of the new housing sites demonstrating that there is adequate capacity to serve the development without leading to problems for existing users. Developers should pay for the survey and of consequential implementation measures.	
Barton Willmore		Our client has commissioned (and paid for) a foul water capacity study by Thames Water to consider the infrastructure improvements that will be required to accommodate the NW Radley allocation. Any improvements required to transfer foul water to the sewage treatment plant will be funded by the developer, and not Thames Water.	Noted.
Pegasus for Redrow		My client notes that several of the Questions (e.g. CA.8, PP.10, PP.18 and CA.13) on the Neighbourhood Plan response form relate to boosting the capacity of local infrastructure (highways, drainage and social). My client fully acknowledges the importance of this issue and is committed to mitigating the impact of the South Kennington development on local infrastructure through the planning application process. Indeed, to this end, my client's consultant team have already started progressing discussions with the relevant statutory bodies. When a planning application is submitted to the District Council, the District Council will formally consult all of the relevant statutory bodies to confirm the capacity of local infrastructure and the mitigation requirements which the proposed development will need to provide and adhere to.	Noted.
Benefice housing group		We would like to emphasize the importance of concerns raised in point 4.11.2 of the Neighbourhood Plan regarding the critical need to improve the sewerage conduits beneath Radley village before any additional demand is added.	Support noted. The revised text included additional material about the problems being encountered in the south of Kennington
Benefice housing group		Concern has been raised regarding increased pressure on the Sandford Lane Brook as drainage conduit for the South Kennington Site. This brook already experiences flooding during intense rainfall events (independent of the flooding of the Thames) – and local residents have reported that on such occasions foul water is becoming mixed with the storm water run-off – and is flowing over pavements. The new hard surfaces of the housing development will inevitably exacerbate these flood peaks and it is essential that a robust solution to this problem is found before construction begins.	
Thames Water		Thames Water consider their standard wording to be more appropriate and as such we recommend the following is included.” It is essential that developers demonstrate that adequate water supply and sewerage infrastructure capacity exists both on and off the site to serve the development and that it would not lead to problems for existing users. In some circumstances this may make it necessary for developers to carry out appropriate studies to ascertain whether the proposed development will lead to overloading of existing water & sewerage infrastructure. Where there is a capacity problem and no improvements are programmed by the water company, then the developer needs to contact the water company to agree what improvements are required and how they will be funded prior to any occupation of the development.”	TW's proposed wording has largely been incorporated in the revised draft. But the proposed wording is taken from the Local Plan site templates and does not seem quite apt for a Planning Policy. Some adjustments have been made to make it more suitable for a Planning Policy and also to reflect the severity of the problems in the NP area.
14		Yes	Support noted
17		Agree	
18		Support	

19		agree though potential consequence is upgrading of Lower Radley pump house with potential increased HGV access on single track road.. require alternative pumping solution?	If the pumping station is made more resilient there should be a reduced need for tanker lorries to access the pumping station, the nuisance of which is agreed
20		Agree.	
23		Supported	
25		Agree	
26		YES they must definitely pay-- a whole new system is the only sensible option. The drains here are not fit for purpose as it is. Thames Water customers do not wish to foot the bill.	
27		Agreed particularly given the numerous recent issues with the sewers.	
28		Definitely. Considering the on-going problems, as demonstrated by the holes dug in the road near the shop and the repeated presence of tankers and pumps, it is vital that no extra pressure is put on the sewers. Indeed we already need the sewage system to be improved, so this should be included in the plan.	
29		Any development should be subject to this requirement before permission is granted. The Village has seen the effects of the 1960s development which was not carried out to the best practice, and the result is sewers collapsing throughout the village. New Developments must not be allowed to connect to this broken system.	
30		As above	
31		As above. The developers and Radley College must pay all costs.	
32		Agree	
33		Agree	
35		I agree.	
	CA13	CA.13 commits RPC to working with Thames Water to ensure that appropriate priority is given to maintaining and upgrading the existing sewerage network.	
14		Yes	Support noted
17		Agree	
18		Support	
19		agree	
20		Agree.	
23		Supported	
25		Agree	

26		Yes but the developers must pay.	The draft provides for developers to meet the costs attributable to their development, but not unrelated problems with the existing infrastructure
27		Agreed particularly given the numerous recent issues with the sewers	Support noted
28		Definitely, as in my comments above. Just patching up the system repeatedly is not the answer. Responding to problems, causing trouble, inconvenience and distress to residences, so the problem needs to be sorted out properly, not just patched up for a while.	
29		The Vale of White Horse should also be looking to ensure that housing developments it is proposing are properly covered by a sewage network fit for purpose	The Vale's Infrastructure Delivery Plan includes a section on sewerage, but the primary responsibility lies with Thames Water
30		agree	
31		Absolutely, but again should be the responsibility of higher authorities than RPC.	Yes, but RPC can lend added weight through the Neighbourhood Plan
32		Very important given the existing problems.	Support noted
33		Agree	
34		Yes, our sewers on Whites Lane get blocked already, so 250 more houses simply cannot use the same sewerage system. Very important.	
35		I agree.	
	CA14	CA.14: Radley is not at the cutting edge of broadband provision, and has a poor level of mobile phone reception. CA.14 commits RPC to working with service providers to deliver reliable superfast broadband and indoor and outdoor mobile reception across the whole parish area and to help with identification of potential sites for new mobile phone masts.	
Jonathan Dockar Drysdale and Theresa Colton, owners of Gooseacre Farm		We believe that the allocation of Radley South for development in LPPt2 will ensure a sufficient critical mass of consumers in Radley village to justify the commercial decision for the IT and mobile phone companies to improve their level of service significantly. We therefore anticipate that fibre optic broadband facilities will be incorporated within any infrastructure development for both the Radley South and Radley North West sites. In this event the existing village will almost certainly benefit from this provision also.	Noted but the policy can be achieved without development of the South Radley site, which is in Green Belt and not supported by the Local Plan
14		Yes	Support noted
17		Agree	
18		Support.	
19		phone masts to be unobtrusive/disguised..	Agree that care is needed over siting and visibility RPC have a potential role in suggesting appropriate sites and opposing inappropriate ones

20		Agree.	Support noted
23		Supported	
25		Agree	
26		yes but be sensitive to people and nature.	See response to respondent 19
27		Agreed - this is very important.	
28		Care to be taken about the siting of masts, as they can be a health hazard. Broadband is increasingly important to people's lives and work, so taking this opportunity to improve provision is very important, especially as there will be greater call upon the service.	See response to respondent 19. The point about OCC funding is noted
29		Perhaps a mast on the Church or on the Memorial Arch at Radley College could be engineered to help reception in the Village. There are grants from Oxfordshire County Council for superfast broadband but it is not clear who should be applying to get such funding. Perhaps the Parish Council ought to put this on its agenda.	
31		No comment.	
32		Agree	Support noted
33		Agree, but I don't think the situation on mobile phone or broadband is all that bad	
35		I agree.	
36		Could the church tower be the site of a new mast?	See response to respondent 19
	CA15 & CA16	CA15 & CA16: RPC's consultation in May 2016 revealed great local concern to retain open countryside, to protect natural habitats and the natural screening provided by existing hedgerows and tree belts. CA 15 & 16 support these policies.	
Jonathan Dockar Drysdale and Theresa Colton, owners of Gooseacre Farm		VWHDC's own Green Belt Review identified Radley South, along with Radley North West, as not contributing any worthwhile landscape benefit to the Green Belt. It is a fact that Gooseacre Farm is conveniently bounded by Thrupp Lane and the grounds of Wick Hall to the west, by Radley Village itself to the north, by the railway line to the east and by the gravel pits to the south. Thus any development on this site is contained by those natural boundaries. Furthermore, development on Radley South does not reduce in any way the essential green belt gap dividing Radley from Abingdon to the west or Kennington to the east. This cannot be said for any of the other sites listed in the NP that have already been allocated in LPPt1. Any development of Radley South would be suitably "greened" by the inclusion of some open spaces and screened by new hedgerow and tree planting. We anticipate that this will in any case be a provision required by the Local Authority.	The final version of the Local Plan retained the South Radley site in Green Belt and did not support its development.

Benefice housing group		We are encouraged to see that the Radley Neighbourhood Plan (4.13.2) concurs with the VWHDC Local Plan in ‘that features such as trees, hedgerows, woodland, field boundaries, watercourses and water bodies should be protected from harmful development and where possible enhanced.’ With this in mind we would like to advocate that the South Kennington site is developed with sensitivity to its proximity to the adjacent ancient woodlands of Radley Great Wood and Radley Little Wood – along with the wooded copse surrounding the brook to the north of the site. We are keen to see, where possible, wildlife corridors incorporated into the design of foot/cycle-paths across the site, and tree-planting included within plans for green spaces.	Support noted. In the revised text a general reference to woodland has been added and also a specific mention of the copse bordering the South Kennington strategic housing site. The developers have said they plan to retain this.
Environment Agency		There are areas of semi-natural ancient woodland within the Parish which should be recognised here. Please also note that there are four Local Wildlife Sites in the Parish, not three. It would be good to have policy which strengthens and builds upon the Local Plan policy for biodiversity as there are important areas within the Parish, which should be protected and enhanced.	This is agreed and the draft plan has been amended to include reference to ancient woodland and to give the correct number of Local Wildlife Sites
14		Yes	Support noted
Natural England		We advise that Sugworth Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) is included on Map 9, which identifies protected areas. Sugworth SSSI is designated for its geological interest, and it’s location and citation is available on the Magic website.	The SSSI has now been added to the map
17		Very concerned about the loss of habitat to wildlife in general and specifically to skylarks nesting in South Kennington Site field.	Under CP46 the Vale will be seeking biodiversity gain from the site, whether directly or indirectly. Under the proposed NP text RPC will work to ensure this.
18		Support. This will also be helped by ensuring new developments are not built to 3-storey heights.	Noted, but the connection with building height is arguable.
19		agree	Support noted
20		Agree.	
23		Supported	
24		Yes please, we need to keep some trees to try to maintain Radley as a village and not a conurbation of Abingdon or Oxford.	
25		Strongly support the retention and provision of natural and semi natural habitats and appropriate accessibility to these habitats for peaceful enjoyment of them. See response to Thrupp lake policy. Existing mature trees within the development sites should be retained and incorporated into the new landscape.	
26		Please do even more if you possibly can. All of our native species are being compromised by urbanisation. hedgerows and long grass are of particular importance. Also shallow water.	
27		Yes - we must retain our village identity	
28		Very important in deed. We must not lose sight of the long term, just to create something in the short term. Once a habitat is gone that is it. We must preserve our wildlife and natural environment.	
29		I fully support the requirement to protect the environment and habitats for our wildlife.	Support noted

30		NW Radley housing site has 2 badger setts located on land plus bats live in this area around the wooded copse and hedgerows both are protected species under law. Who will ensure they are protected during and after building new development.	This will be pursued in response to the planning application for the site
31		I agree.	Support noted
32		Important	
33		Agree	
35		I agree. I would also welcome local co-operation to make hedgehog-friendly routes between back gardens.	Yes, go for it
36		I support these aims.	Support noted
	Any Other points		
Barton Willmore		Throughout the RNP there is mention of 'Appendix A'. It is understood that this refers to Appendix A of the Local Plan and does not refer to an Appendix to the Neighbourhood Plan; this needs to be clarified within the text.	Yes and this is clarified in the revised draft
Benefice housing group		We would draw attention to the decision made by Vale of White Horse District Council in June 2015 (noted in point 3.1 of the RNP) to remove the North Abingdon Strategic area from the Radley Neighbourhood Planning area – because the Vale of White Horse considered this block of housing to have a “stronger relationship to Abingdon than Radley village, particularly with regard to road and community infrastructure needs”. A similar principle applies to the 270 houses of the South Kennington Strategic area – which will clearly depend upon, and have an impact on the infrastructure and services of Kennington – services which naturally fall outside of the Radley Neighbourhood Plan. We are reassured that Kennington and Radley Parish Councils are cooperating over the implications of the development.	Policies relating to the south Kennington strategic site have been developed in discussion with Kennington Parish Council
1		All other proposals we agree with as drafted	Support noted
10		I think that communication from Radley Parish Council is poor. In fact I don't feel I know what is happening. In my previous town we had a residents' newsletter delivered to each household twice a year to inform people about what was happening.	We do not consider that this criticism is justified. The Parish Council has gone to considerable lengths to keep local residents informed. There were major consultation exercises in May 2016 and January 2017, both involving the hand delivery of information to every household. In addition, there is a monthly report of progress in Radley News, and monthly email updates circulated to those who opt to be on our mailing list.

		I support the speed limit on Kennington Road between Sugworth Lane and Park End Farm should be reduced (it is currently national speed limit)	The revised draft emphasises the need for traffic calming to reduce speeds on the approach to Kennington. It would be difficult to justify a 30mph limit on the open stretch between Radley and Kennington
		A new crossing needs to be placed on Kennington Road between Radley College Sports Centre and the church. Cars travel too fast along Kennington Road (and still nothing has been done about this by the Parish Council). It would provide a safe crossing point for: i) children from Radley Primary School crossing for swimming and other lessons at Radley College ii) Residents crossing to the Radley College Sports Centre or to the public footpaths to Bigwood, etc iii) Residents from the Park homes, Sugworth Lane, Kennington Road and Radley College walking to Radley Station. iv) Children from the Park homes, Sugworth Lane, Kennington Road and Radley College walking to and from school.	The siting of a pedestrian crossing at this point raises some practical difficulties, but the case might be stronger with additional housing nearby including housing for College staff and RPC will raise this in discussion with the College.
13		Radley village will continue whatever shape it takes, however we believe that in order for our community to truly thrive, it is essential that there is a balance between the design of the village and how it supports the activities we would wish to undertake as a community. For example, Summer Fetes, BBQs, bonfire nights, Church, Palm Sunday, Lantern Walk, Sunday Cricket, Football Team, Kids Clubs, Retirement Clubs etc, etc – all these types of activities would reflect a thriving community. It is not clear from the RNP how the design will support the activities of an enlarged community, rather it appears to be attempting to change as little as possible without consideration to the community we will become. We would strongly urge the RPC to consider establishing a hub or links between facilities to ensure future community cohesion.	Maintaining community cohesion is a key objective of the Neighbourhood Plan and at the heart of its policies for new expanded community facilities, support for the community shop, the extension of the primary school, the possible development of the allotment site and the connectivity of the new and existing developments.
		As members of several key stakeholder groups (Radley Primary, School Governors and the PCC) we are very disappointed not to have been consulted or had any input into the RNP. You really do need to seek and incorporate the views of local parents for all matters relating to the school. We currently believe you have a very one-sided view and have not gathered the data to understand the wishes of the full community.	RPC does not accept this comment. Views have been sought widely, including from Radley households individually and all the bodies mentioned in this comment.
14		The current play area at Gooseacre is dated and needs replacing with improved facilities There has been significant lost opportunity in not working more closely with Radley College due to suspicion of their motives and a false idea that change could be prevented. The original proposals provided a very large recreational area between Radley and S. Kennington designed to protect Radley from further development and a new school and village centre. RPC should have strongly supported this proposal. Many of the potential wins now seem to be gone and we are stuck with very few wins and many big losses. Its now a very depressing situation.	CA 3 proposes that the play area should be looked at as part of a wider re-imagining of the Gooseacre facilities. RPC has had regular open discussions with Radley College through the process of Plan preparation. Radley College withdrew the proposals for the development referred to in this comment in August 2015.
18		The plan is generally excellent despite comments above. However, recent media reports suggest such plans are easily overridden by District Councils. How will we prevent this? Does the Parish Council have a strategy to mobilise opposition if we find ourselves in this situation e.g. through use of the media?	RPC will consider how best to deal with difficult situations as they arise.

19		Great piece of work, thank you. Would like to see more integrated approach to village facilities through collaboration between all commercial interests (station/pub/shop/hall) on the basis of common interest given increased customer base and potential revenue..	Agree that more collaboration between these different bodies is desirable.
		On a more trivial point the cover illustration, while beautiful, is overly bucolic given the size of the developments imposed! Maybe a more urban cover would be more appropriate	This viewpoint is recognised but we would not want to change the ‘look’ of the Plan midway through the process.
20		Substantial boundary fencing should be installed & funded by the Developer to existing houses in Ferny Close that look across the NW Radley site & border the drainage ditch. This will be necessary due to open aspect of most rear garden boundaries in that location.	This is being considered in the development management process for the site
24		Yes I would like to record my thanks for all the hard work the Parish Council and others have done to produce such a professional document and the many opportunities we the residents have for feedback. It is appreciated.	Noted
25		The layout of the village is not how one might it if starting from scratch, as it lacks a geographical centre, with amenities located there. However, the development options do not seem to provide scope for addressing that issue, so we need to do the best within the current constraints. The point about access routes being inside, to focus the communities inwards goes some way to address this.	Noted - this point is agreed
		I would advocate improved pedestrian infrastructure throughout the village in particular along Foxborough road, where pedestrians are in dangerous close proximity to traffic including buses (the wing mirrors of which protrude over the pavement at approximately the height of a tall adult such as myself) by virtue of narrow pavements. These act as an effective barrier to travelling to school on foot, and promote traffic growth. If the current hall and playing ground are to stay where they are (I support this) pedestrian access will be key to ensuring their benefits are realised. A segregated cycle way through the village is essential to ensure the railway can be accessed from Abingdon, in a sustainable way. Likewise a segregated cycle way to the school primary school should be a high priority to enable safe, health promoting transport for children and parent school alike.	Theses concerns are understood. The proposed route hierarchy should reduce traffic along Foxborough Road and Church Road. Providing the proposed new link through the North West Radley housing site should also reduce the need for some to walk along this route. Unfortunately there are practical problems of space in widening the pavements and/or adding a segregated cycle track, so there is no easy way of dealing fully with the problem.
26		The gravel pits in Whites Lane always used to have grass snakes-- a protected species-- and occasionally the odd one has turned up in Foxborough Road-- the most recent in 2015-- sad to say I found him injured by a strimmer (used by the council or someone else employed to cut grass near the bungalows opposite the shop) and I put him in long grass behind the allotments-- (I wish I had thought to take him to Tiggywinkles wildlife hospital.)	The draft NP draws attention to the need to protect this area of woodland, which is a valuable habitat as well as providing screening, and this will also be pursued through the development control process for the North West Radley housing site. If there is a loss of biodiversity on the site the developer will have to off-set this elsewhere in the area
		No doubt the developers will say they have “taken advice” or whatever euphemism is the spin vocabulary of the day, but I would have thought that the relevant bodies should look for the snakes using something they call “felts” in order to ascertain if they still inhabit the area. (Why would they not?) In any case I think that when a wild area like the “gravel pits” is taken for development, an alternative wild area should be provided.	

28		What is the effect going to be on the parish council itself, when the village is doubled in size? How will it be constituted and how will it be structured to cater for the needs of so many residents?	This situation is still some way off. In the meantime, the PC's work in scrutinising and influencing the extensive development proposals is already imposing a major strain on the time of councillors and the clerk. PC doors are always open to individuals prepared to contribute to the work.
30		I would like to thank Scilla Dudding for the energy and time she has applied to this process. Also to Richard Dudding and the other members of the Neighbourhood Plan Committee who have helped formulate ideas. The reports which have been produced show a level of professionalism which is a credit to the Parish Council and it ought to be a matter of public record that this process would not have happened without the leadership of this remarkable Councillor.	Noted
32		1. I am confused and disappointed that from initially objecting to the building of 900 homes in our tiny village RPC, for all its hard work, now "believes that the proposed new housing could make Radley an even better place to live etc. etc." What support was solicited from Nicola Blackwood, and from other parishes and towns in the Vale which did not want their environments ruined?	The PC was actively engaged in a variety of activities to limit new development in the parish prior to the adoption of the Local Plan Part 1. However, now that the Local Plan is in place confirming that there will be development at three strategic sites, the PC believes that the priority must be to try to get the best from the developments in the interests of local people.
		2. Working hours on the proposed construction sites. We are about to have our relative peace and quiet shattered for several years by the noise from these sites and the extra traffic which will accompany them. Will there be any restrictions on the times work commences and finishes every day? Are we to be subjected to Saturday and Sunday mornings being disturbed by the noise of builders at work and the sound of their vehicles?	RPC will seek restrictions through the development management process for the strategic sites.
		3. With all the new houses that are proposed to be built in the Vale and all the significant (and insignificant) development that has been ongoing for the last 40 years, are questions being asked to V.W.H.D.C. and Central Government about new road systems to accommodate all the extra traffic that these developments engender? (By that I do not mean the provision of better cycle tracks and de-luxe bus shelters.) It seems obvious to me that these authorities have seen fit to bend the rules regarding green belts and have foisted upon us, the people of central England, massive building programmes without taking any responsibility for the consequences and without looking for other solutions to housing problems.	RPC aims to use its limited resources as effectively as possible to influence central and local government policies resulting in development which impacts on Radley people.
34		I would also like to see an extension of the network of footpaths around the parish. It's good to preserve the countryside, but we also need to see and enjoy it!	Agreed. The proposed new cycletrack will also be suitable for walkers and the Radley Lakes strategy should also open up more of the Lakes area for walking.
36		I congratulate councillors and volunteers on a huge amount of careful and persuasive work. Without knowing anything about the recommended structure of a sound neighbourhood plan, I wonder if it could be shortened, possibly by putting some of the background information in appendixes or accompanying documents.	Material has been shortened where possible.

38		While the need for further development is necessary, the plan acknowledges the very real concerns of further development and the impact on the whole community.	Noted
Structure and layout of plan			
VOWH		We recommend: Section 1.4 ‘Vision and Objectives’ being a standalone section to support clarity in decision making for future planning applications. Section 1.1 ‘The Legal Context’ and the second and third paragraph of Section 1.4 ‘The Vale of White Horse Local Plan,’ are merged to create a ‘legal and policy context’ section. In doing so, paragraph one of Section 1.4 could be moved to ‘Part 3 Developing the Plan’. Section 2.1 ‘The Purpose of the Neighbourhood Plan’ could also be moved to Part 3 because it largely describes why the Parish Council Decided to prepare a neighbourhood plan, or this could become a Foreword. Section 2.3 Treatment of Cross Boundary Matters, which discusses how these matters were considered in the development of the plan, could be moved to Part 3.	Vision and objectives are now a stand alone section. We have kept a separate section headed ‘Major housing development proposals’ as we consider this to be an important piece of context which is different in nature from the legal context. We have dropped the ‘purpose’ section. Treatment of cross boundary matters has been moved as suggested to Part 3.
VOWH		We recommend including a reference to Local Plan Part 2 (if the detail is known before submission) to compliment the section on Local Plan Part 1.	Agreed
VOWH		We recommend reducing the amount of description of process in Part 3 and increasing the discussion on what was found out and how this support the plan’s preparation including vision, objectives and policy. Part 3 of the plan is already very helpful and shows the process of the plan’s development. It demonstrates the hard work that has gone into producing the draft plan. The Parish Council may wish to consider moving some of this finer detail to the consultation statement to reduce the length of the final plan. It would also be preferable to see more detail of what was said or found out, rather than only a description of what was carried out. It is recognised that some of this detail is contained in some of the policy sections.	Some of the detail of process has been moved to the consultation statement and some comments added to link the results of consultation to policies. However, to minimise repetition and maximise clarity and understanding, we consider it best to report relevant views in more detail as part of the context in individual policy sections.
Radley Village Shop		A minor point but, in addition to their presentation in the different sections of Part 4, a listing of all the PPs and CAs in one place in the Plan (possibly at the end) would provide more coherence and make it easier for readers.	Agreed. This has been done in the revised text.
Community Actions			
VOWH		We recommend that the Community Actions are very clearly distinguished in the document. Any non-planning content must be very clearly distinct from land-use policies. This is a land-use planning document. We recommend that all supporting text in the document directly supports the vision, objectives and subsequently land-use planning policy by providing context and/or justification. Any supporting text relating solely to the inclusion of Community Actions should be deleted or must be separated clearly from that which supports the land-use policies of the document. Community actions and text should move to an appendix, for example.	This has been discussed with the Vale, as a result of which the revised draft differentiates the Community Actions much more clearly. However to put them solely in a separate annex would result in fragmentation of the narrative
Barton Willmore		Our client is concerned about the reference to Community Actions being labelled ‘policies’ - in this instance CA1, CA2 and CA3. We suggest that the ‘Community Actions’ should be described as ‘objectives’ in aiding the delivery of the policies, to differentiate from the specific Planning Policies of the RNP. Moreover, the Community Actions appear largely aspirational and thus we question whether their inclusion as policies is appropriate.	See above. The Community Actions and the Planning Policies are both designed to deliver the Plan’s objectives, but in different ways. The suggested change of terminology would not reflect this. However it is accepted that the NP needs to explain and differentiate them better, and this is done in the revised draft.

More general points			
VOWH		We recommend: That the basis of all maps are Ordnance Survey and we can advise on suitable scales. Including an overall ‘policies map,’ which sets out all of the planning proposals in the neighbourhood plan. That all of the maps in the draft neighbourhood plan should be displayed on a full page and clearly labelled with the neighbourhood area boundary, north arrow, scale bar, title, key and policy references. That text supporting the maps should be on the same or an adjacent page. That a more detailed map of the built up area should be included in the appropriate location within the plan. That all appropriate designations should be included on maps, set at an appropriate scale.	This has been discussed with the Vale. All the maps are anyway drawn on an OS base, but it is accepted that this needs to be made clear and that all maps should have a scale and north arrow. However dependant on what the map is trying to achieve there is a case for some variation in style and size. All of this is reflected in the revised draft.
VOWH		We also recommend including; Proposed sites for development, community facilities, all historical and environmental designations. Each policy proposal should also be clearly mapped.	
VOWH		We recommend separating the Community Actions and supporting text by including them in an appendix to the plan. It should be clearly recognised in the supporting text that the neighbourhood plan makes an important and significant contribution to the improvement of the ‘Radley Lakes’ area, through both planning policies and separate community actions. The planning policies can be accompanied, and amplified, by community actions. However, it must be made clear that although linked, planning policies are not relying on community actions to be delivered	
Part 3: Developing the Plan - the process			
Radley Col.		The Steering Group, rather than being a subset of Parish Councillors and individual appointees, should have included delegated representatives from the Church, the primary school, the pub, the village hall committee, Radley College, the community shop, sporting and other groups. We recognise you may have had a small number of meetings with representatives of these groups individually, including with ourselves, but these have been bilateral meetings and there has never been a representative steering committee (despite our recommendation at the outset) or working party of stakeholders, nor even a workshop to surface issues together.	RPC’s engagement with both individuals and village institutions throughout the process was extensive and proactive, as reported in section 3 of the Plan and the Consultation Statement. RPC has no record of ever having received a proposal to set up a Steering Group comprising delegated representatives of village institutions and does not consider that this would have been a suitable vehicle for developing the Neighbourhood Plan. There was an open invitation to all residents to get involved in the work throughout the process, and Radley College and other organisations could have taken up this offer at any stage.
Barton Willmore		Radley College expressed interest in joining the steering committee as part of formal engagement, yet this offer was not accepted and as above only limited engagement has taken place. It is noted within the Planning Practice Guidance that as part of stage 2 ‘Preparing a draft neighbourhood plan or Order’, qualifying bodies should (inter alia): • engage and consult those living and working in the neighbourhood area and those with an interest in or affected by the proposals (eg service providers); and • talk to land owners and the development industry. Our client considers this engagement imperative to the creation of an informed and credible Neighbourhood Plan, which has been the subject of a transparent consultation process. Unfortunately, through the lack of positive engagement, we consider this to not be the case. The comments that follow reflect the fact that engagement to date has been limited. This becomes particularly pertinent where the Neighbourhood Plan makes certain expectations and assumptions of our client, few of which have been discussed or agreed prior to the publication of the draft RNP. We trust therefore that the comments set out in this submission are given appropriate consideration as matters progress.	

Radley C of E Primary school		There has been limited engagement with Radley Primary School. I understand a representative of RPC met with the headteacher, and the then Chair of Governors, to explore the school's views on what a major housing development might mean for the school, as well as having a tour of the school building. However, this was in September 2015 and there has been no involvement with the parent body, or the governing body as a whole. This is despite the Primary School being identified as an Infrastructure Priority on Page 10 of the RNCP. It seems unusual that a draft Plan could be published without more prior engagement with stakeholder groups, rather than individual residents. For example the school is not represented on the RNCP steering group and is conspicuous in its absence on the 'Stakeholder meeting notes and statements' on your website.	The primary school is a crucial part of the village and RPC has endeavored to keep in touch with it throughout the process. RPC sought and obtained a meeting with the Chair of Governors and Headteacher in September 2015; the note was withheld from the website at the Headteacher's request. The Steering Group chair suggested a further meeting to explore the school's views in August 2016 but this offer was not taken up.
Deliverability			
Radley College		There are a number of aspects of the Neighbourhood Plan which are reliant on the support of, and agreement from, third parties. We feel it is a shame there has not been more collaborative engagement through the process, and there is a risk that the plan, in its current form, unduly raises expectations within the community, especially as we had already raised our concerns prior to the publication of this draft.	It is within the scope of a development plan to include policies on which development permission will be conditional, and measures which will be required to mitigate its impact. The NP retains such policies where RPC considers them to be in the best interests of Radley even where the landowner/ developer has not agreed them.
Part 2 context			
Radley College		While Part 1 of the Local Plan has been adopted, Part 2 is at an earlier stage. A number of the proposals in the Local Plan cut across potential future land allocations in Part 2 of the Plan, and it would seem appropriate to await publication of a draft Part 2 plan before adoption of the Neighbourhood Plan, or to make reference to the fit between these separate planning processes.	National policy and guidance does not require progress on Neighbourhood Plans to be put on hold while the preparation of Local Plans are in progress. Reference to Part 2 updated.
Approach to strategic sites			
Barton Willmore		As an overall observation our client would note that the references within the RNP to the Local Plan proposals is unduly negative. Our client considers that setting the scene so negatively at the outset is unnecessary and unhelpful and does not pave the way for successful collaborative working in the future. Nor does it instil a sense of positive and proactive approach to planning, which is encouraged by national policy. In order to constitute a positive and constructive document our client considers that this context should be removed.	RPC is fully committed to collaborative working on the proposed developments and to achieving the best possible results for Radley people.
Part 5 - funding			
Radley College		As a developer, Radley College will be making contributions via CIL and S106 as appropriate, and in accordance with the Local Plan. We do not see a need for further contribution, albeit support the Parish Council in applying its greater share of CIL payment if the plan is adopted, in investing in the ways anticipated in the plan.	RPC believes it has a role, working with the Vale and OCC, in shaping the detailed requests for s.106 funding. This is in practice happening through the development management process and it is reasonable that the NP should set out RPC's requirements. The text makes clear that this is subject to the Local Plan's policies on funding, including viability testing.

AWE		There would be other benefits to offer RPC and the community: a new site to the east of Radley South of a size suitable to relocate and build a new Village Hall, and make provision for pitches, cricket ground, allotments, children’s play area etc. as shown on the Concept Plan (Appendix 1). The availability of the current site for development could enable Radley College to fund the new building and provision of the facilities. Additional funding, doubling that from Radley NW, could contribute to items including the Radley Lakes proposal and to education provision. There is also a possibility of land being made available to implement the proposed connection to Audlett Drive.	RPC is grateful to the owners of Gooseacre Farm for the thought given to the benefits which the community might derive should permission be granted for the development of their site. These have attractions. However, RPC considers that the loss of green belt and large-scale housing development already agreed to take place in the parish is more than enough for the community to absorb over the lifetime of the Plan. RPC does not support the development of the Gooseacre site.
Jonathan Dockar Drysdale and Theresa Colton, owners of Gooseacre Farm		We are advised by AWE that the Radley South site can accommodate up to 240 new homes (compared with Radley North West – 280 homes). If Radley South is allocated, therefore, the public funding that will be generated from Section 106 and CIL contributions will be almost doubled. It will also enable RPC to promote their own central allotment area, to be developed for mixed use including residential, which, if approved, would make further sums available for the community. A unique window of opportunity therefore lies in RPC’s hands to maximise the benefits of such a financial windfall for Radley Village and its residents. Instead of the NP being simply a wish list of projects, in isolation of the national and local housing shortfall, it could become a serious planning policy document with the financial clout to see many of its worthy aspirational and visionary aims realised.	
Part 2 - objectives			
OCC		Although several criteria with direct relevance to public health are included in Part 2, such as the desire to protect the “sense of community”, improve community facilities and ensure “all parts of the parish are readily accessible by foot and bicycle” neither the Vision nor the Objectives make overt reference to improving the health and wellbeing of residents. Key general points to consider including in this section and linking in with the Planning Policies that follow might include encouraging the development of an environment which: provides opportunities for people to be more active (although improving health and wellbeing is included within Part 4.8.2 the “Cycling and Walking Strategy for Radley” it could also be used to reinforce the case for active travel infrastructure to schools, pedestrian crossings and the provision of new playing fields/leisure and recreation facilities). provides opportunities to make healthier food choices (this could be linked to the aspiration to expand the community shop and the provision of additional allotments) fosters good mental health and wellbeing by increasing opportunities for social interaction/reducing social isolation and loneliness (this could be linked to the aspiration to bring community facilities together as set out in Part 4.4.1, the desire for any extension of Radley Primary School to be constructed with wider community uses in mind and the development of Radley Lakes for quiet recreation and leisure purposes). enables people to maintain their independence for longer (although it is recognised that the needs of an increasing proportion of older people must be met with specific housing types, this could also be used to make the case for new builds to meet ‘lifetime homes’ standards, locally accessible amenities and services, and public realm that considers the needs of older people, such as bus stops with suitable seating)	A reference to health and well-being is now included in the Plan objectives.
OCC		The above are supported by NPPF paragraphs 7, 35, 50, 69, 156 and the PPG ‘Health and Wellbeing’ chapter and would also help to make the case for CIL funding.	See above

OCC		Although Part 4.5.2 cites “reducing the use of the car for the school run” it does not set out the health and wellbeing benefits of active travel to school. To help improve pupil wellbeing and academic attainment whilst also reducing inactivity, obesity, air pollution and congestion I strongly recommend that the health and wellbeing benefits of active travel to school are included within the criteria for this section. The above is supported by NPPF paragraphs 35 and 38.	We support this statement but are not convinced that the NP is the right place to pursue it.
OCC		In Part 4.7 ‘Roads’ cycling and walking are repeatedly labelled as ‘leisure’ activities whilst Part 4.8.2 the “Cycling and Walking Strategy for Radley” clearly highlights their importance as a healthy and efficient mode of transport to local amenities and facilities, schools, nearby settlements and the railway station. I strongly recommend that unless referring to quiet recreational areas, such as Radley Lakes, cycling and walking are always considered in both a utility and recreational capacity. The above is supported by NPPF paragraphs 35, 38 and 69.	The revised text brings out the recreational benefits of cycling and walking
OCC		To maximise the behavioural change potential of new active travel infrastructure, we strongly recommend that Part 4.8.2 the “Cycling and Walking Strategy for Radley” highlights the importance of appropriately phased development i.e. people moving into new developments are more likely to adopt healthier day-to-day lifestyle habits when health promoting infrastructure, such as walkways and cycle paths, is already in place. The above is supported by NPPF paragraph 177.	This is a good point and will be pursued through the development management process
Environment Agency		Section 2.2. It would be good if this section acknowledged the rich biodiversity found within the Parish as it is home to protected species, Local Wildlife Sites and areas of semi-natural ancient woodland.	An objective has been added to this section covering biodiversity.
Built heritage			
Historic England		It is up to the community to determine their own agenda for neighbourhood planning, which can either supplement policy in the local plan or even replace non-strategic policy. The local plan’s strategic policies for the quality of design, local distinctiveness and the historic environment provide a strong basis for managing the design of new development to ensure that the value of these aspects of the environment area sustained. This is well supported by their Design Guidance SPD. As such we are not concerned that the plan does not provide a strong direction on these matters, which will nevertheless be given consideration in decision-making.	Noted
Historic England		It is not clear whether preparation of the plan has included review of the area’s historic environment. We note that the substantial scheduled monuments in the south of the plan area are shown on Map 9 but it is necessary to determine whether any heritage assets, including non-designated assets (i.e. not on the National List or a conservation area) would be affected by proposals in the plan. If this hasn’t been done, we advise that the consideration of the choice of sites should include review of any potential for sites of archaeological interest recorded on the County’s Historic Environment Record that their development would affect. This is a requirement set out in the National Planning Practice Guidance for Neighbourhood Plans.	In the light of these helpful comments a new policy and supporting text has been added dealing with heritage assets, especially archaeology