

Response	Policy no	Comment	Plan response
	<b>PP1</b>	<b>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.</b>	
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 or it could become a car park for visitors if Thrupp Lane is closed off near this point.	
14		OK	
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.	
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.	
29		I support the development on this site. Small sites such as this ought to be given priority over large development sites.	
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	
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.	
Policy no	Comment	Plan response	
	<b>PP2 and CA1</b>	<b>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 &amp; CA3).</b>	
10		I would support a larger village shop, with a post office counter.	
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.
- 17 No comment
- 18 Support with these provisos
- 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.
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.

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.

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

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?

32 Support

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.

Policy no	Comment	Plan response
	<b>PP3</b>	<b>PP3. Inappropriate development outside the built-up area of the village will not be approved except in very special circumstances.</b>
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.
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.

Policy no Comment Plan response

**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.**

10 I would support retirement apartments. But housing for young people and families needs to be provided.

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.

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.

17 Agree

18 Three-storey developments such as those on the old MG site should be refused. They are out of character with the village.

19 agree

20 We would oppose any building above 2 storeys high & would welcome the inclusion of some single storey properties (other than retirement bungalows).

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

25 Agree. This will ensure efficient use of the housing stock by freeing up existing housing in Radley which resident are seeking to downsize from.

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.

27 Yes - the village should have a significant say in this.

28 Very good.

- 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.
- 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
- 31 The developers will build exactly what they want to build.
- 32 Agree
- 33 Agree
- 35 I agree.
- 36 Yes I agree with this

Policy no	Comment	Plan response
	<b>PP5</b>	<b>PP5. Provision of plots of land for self-build on the new sites will be supported.</b>
14		Yes but not priority and only if they are in keeping with current development
17		Agree
18		Strongly support. This will reduce the monotony of typical new housing developments.
19		Yes though safeguards on abuse by individual developers should be made - e.g. cannot be sold for 5years
20		Covenants should be in place to restrict the building of properties higher than 2 storeys.
23		It's not clear how this would be enforced in practise. Not supported
25		No strong view. Important that any self build and estate build meet high design standards.
26		Good idea. Didn't see any such thing on the Radley College plans for Whites Lane.
27		Yes - how would these plots be allocated and would existing residents be able to apply?
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.
30		I doubt developer will agree to this
31		N/a. As PP4.
32		Approve
33		Agree
35		I agree.

Policy no	Comment	Plan response
-----------	---------	---------------

**CA2**      **CA2. RPC will oppose any proposals for the four mobile home sites to be converted to other uses.**

- 14      Yes
- 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?
- 23      No opinion
- 24      Yes, the mobile home sites must be protected. They are an important part of our village.
- 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.
- 28      Yes, it would be most unfair on residents who have lived there for years and would have difficulty finding somewhere else to live.
- 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.
- 31      I agree.
- 32      Agree
- 33      Agree
- 35      I agree.
- 36      I agree with this approach.

Policy no      Comment      Plan response

**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.**

- 10      I do not think the village hall should be at Gooseacre. I think it should be closer to the church.

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

15 Please take into the account of 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.

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.

19 Creation of hall/shop/pub/station facilities should be considered as a whole e.g. combined facility at pub/station/allotment site??

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

27 Agreed - this is a good site but parking for an extended facility would need to be carefully considered

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.

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.

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.

31 I agree.

32 Agree

33 Agree. I would have preferred the move to Church Rd but understand the reasons for not doing so

35 I agree.

36 I fully support this strategy.

Policy no    Comment    Plan response

**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.**

- 7 3. Shop. Are we going to get some younger staff that are not so muddled up on 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.
- 14 Yes
- 15 Or the area around the pub as outlined in response to PP2 CA1.
- 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 tho as some of the delivery lorries are large!
- 25 No strong view re location, but a bigger site likely to be required commensurate with expansion in village population.
- 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.
- 27 Yes - I would support this and it would keep the shop near to the station and accessible to residents of the village
- 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.
- 29 No comment
- 30 Agree
- 31 I agree, but NOT on the allotment site.
- 32 Agree
- 33 Strongly agree
- 35 I agree.
- 36 The shop needs larger premises even if the allotments prove to be unsuitable.

Policy no Comment Plan response

**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.**

- 14      Yes
- 17      Agree
- 18      Strongly support. We must not end up with less allotment area or fewer allotments.
- 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!
- 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.
- 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.
- 31      I agree.
- 32      Agree
- 33      Agree
- 35      I agree.
- 36      Perhaps landowners/developers could be approached for a larger village shop site.

Policy no      Comment      Plan response

**CA6**      **CA6. RPC should work with Radley College to provide a site for an additional cemetery.**

- 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.
- 14      Yes
- 17      No comment
- 18      Agreed but see response to CA3.
- 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.  
 What about the field which runs from the church car park up towards the allotments?  
 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.

27 Yes - agreed

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,

30 agree

31 Radley College should already have this sorted. I doubt that they care a fig for the residents of Radley.

32 Agree

33 Agree

35 No opinion.

Policy no	Comment	Plan response
	<b>PP6</b>	<b>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.</b>
14		Should be developed into green recreational space
17		Agree
18		Support
19		See CA3
20		Agree, negotiations with Greene King should continue.
23		Supported
24		It is a shame the village is unable to use this for development of a new community shop. The site would be perfect.
25		Agree
26		I believe it belongs to the Brewery?

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 playparke to be where the children live-- that is on the new housing estates and near the Village Hall.

28 OK, but consider safety issues on the bed 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.

29 Perhaps the Village ought to buy the pub off Greene King and convert part of it into a shop. .

30 This area needs tidying up and planting with seats, grants may be available from WWHDC

31 Vague.

32 Very supportive

33 Agree

35 I agree.

36 I agree.

Policy no	Comment	Plan response
	<b>PP7&amp;8</b>	<b>PP7 &amp; 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.</b>
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
17		Agree but object to it being called the 'South Kennington Site'
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.
23		Not sure why the North end is the best location for the playground, a central location may be better. Support PP8.
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.
25		Yes- communal facilities are going to be key for new developments.
26		Yes.
28		Yes, it would be needed for that area, caught between the Coop and Radley Village Shop.

- 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.
- 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
- 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.
- 32 Agree
- 33 Agree
- 35 I agree.

Response	Policy no	Comment	Plan response
	<b>PP9</b>	<b>PP9. Where replacement sites or buildings are needed for community facilities they should, if practicable, be ready before the old facilities are removed.</b>	
14		Yes	
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.	
28		Of course.	
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.	
30		yes	
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.	
32		Definitely	
33		Agree, but only if this does not conflict with achieving the best solution overall	
35		I agree.	

Response	Policy no	Comment	Plan response
----------	-----------	---------	---------------

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.**

- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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 Collage's original proposal to build new school and new village centre
- 17 Agree
- 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.)

28 Certainly.

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

Response	Policy	Comment	Plan response
	<b>CA8</b>	<b>CA8. RPC will press for and support the expansion of nursery facilities at St Swithun's primary school.</b>	
10		I don't think we should be supporting expansion of Nursery places in Kenington, whic 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.	
14		Yes	
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.	

Response	Policy	Comment	Plan response
----------	--------	---------	---------------

**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.**

- 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 GOS, nurses, physiotherapists, etc as appropriate.
- 14 Yes
- 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
- 20 Agree.
- 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.
- 30 agree
- 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.

Response	Policy no	Comment	Plan response
1	CA9,PP11	CA9, PP11 and PP12 promote RPC's strategy for the Radley Lakes area. We agree with the proposals	

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.

13 We fully support all of your proposals for this area

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.

19 agree

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.

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

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.

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.

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.

32 Agree

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

35 I agree with all aspects of the proposed strategy.

36 I support RPC strategy to solve the difficult problem of Thrupp Lane conflicts.

Response Policy

Comment

Plan response

**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 bypass the houses at the south end of the road, and possibly a smoothing of the bends.**

- 14 Agree
- 17 No comment
- 18 Already the de facto through route; and agreed the current junction is dangerous. Support.
- 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 thro to Radley?
- 20 We support this.
- 23 The junction needs to be improved but the bends should not be smoothed. Significant traffic calming is required on White's Lane.
- 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.
- 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
- 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.  
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.

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.

Re. "bypass the houses"-- do you mean in Whites Lane? A bit ambiguous here!

27 Agreed - the junction must be a key part of the proposals to enable effective traffic flow

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.

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.

29 Agree this is a sensible proposal

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

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

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.

36 There should be roundabout here to act as a traffic calming measure which will complement the one suggested for Sugworth Lane.

Response	Policy	Comment	Plan response
		<b>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.</b>	
14		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		Strongly agree. Road should then be resurfaced and repaired; potholes currently make it hazardous to cyclists.	
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 thrip 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.	
32		Extremely important	
33		Strongly agree	
35		I agree.	
36		I fully support this.	
Response	Policy	Comment	Plan response

**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.**

- 17 Agree and would suggest that the four-way junction includes a mini round-about
- 19 agree
- 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.

Response	Policy	Comment	Plan response
		<b>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 &amp; Ride site at Lodge Hill.</b>	
2		Ref Sugworth Lane. Must be made wider and straighter to take the increase of traffic in both directions with propert 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
- 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.

Response	Policy	Comment	Plan response
		<b>Resurfacing the road carrying the 35 bus route through Radley and Kennington should be a priority.</b>	
14		Yes	
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!

Response	Policy	Comment	Plan response
14		<b>RPC should work with Sustrans and landowners to improve Sustrans Route 5 across the parish.</b> Yes.	
17		There needs to be more emphasis in the plan to suggest and promote more strongly cycle routes through the new developments and village 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.	
19		agree but unclear whether/how much it is/will be used - cost benefit tbc?	
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.	
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.	
29		I support this aspiration but believe that most cyclists prefer to use the roads rather than cycle ways.	
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	
31		No comment.	
32		Agree	
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.

Response	Policy	Comment	Plan response
		<b>Path 8 from White's Lane to Twelve Acre Drive should be improved.</b>	
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 cvclina to school.	
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.	
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	
30		Is this the same as above ?	
31		I think it would be better to encourage cyclists to use this path; signing perhaps?	
32		Agree	
33		Agree	
35		I agree.	
36		This should be 3m wide segregated cycle/pedestrian route.	

Response	Policy	Comment	Plan response
		<b>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.</b>	
14		Yes	
17		Ageed	
18		Possibly. However I will believe the new sports facilities when I see them.	

19 agree  
 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  
 30 As above  
 31 Route?  
 32 Agree  
 33 Agree  
 35 Welcome in principle, but it does not look practicable to create a direct route.  
 36 I fully support this!

Response	Policy	Comment	Plan response
		<b>There should be general improvements to cycleways and pavements and provision for secure cycle storage.</b>	
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.	
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.	
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.	
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.	
17		Agreed	
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).  
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 mewhere there is safety for my bike.
- 29 I would rather see the pot holes mended
- 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.
- 32 Agree
- 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.

Response	Policy	Comment	Plan response
	<b>PP15</b>	<b>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.</b>	
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.	
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	
17		Agree	
18		Support	

- 19 agree
- 20 Pathways & cycleways should not create a nuisance problem to existing properties.
- 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.
- 24 Yes this is good for the environment and for health.
- 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.
- 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.

Response	Policy	Comment	Plan response
	<b>CA12</b>	<b>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.</b>	
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?	

- 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 not 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 out front garden our driveway and our private nature reserve. With that in mind surely 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- I agree with the need for additional 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 will have their ticket and other passengers can buy tickets on the train or at their destination.
- 14 Yes
- 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.
- 19 See CA3 - parking and station facilities to be part of shop/hall/pub development??
- 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.

- 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.
- 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
- 24 A ticket machine as soon as possible please.
- 25 Parking should be disincentivised 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?  
access to up-line-- definitely. make it disabled -friendly.  
Please do not extend any solution which increases the on-road parking in the area around the station entrance. It is dangerous enough already.  
Bike storage--liaise with pub?  
access to up-line-- definitely. make it disabled -friendly.  
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.
- 30 On going problems needs monitoring
- 31 No comment.
- 32 Agree, especially step free access to the up line.
- 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.

Response Policy

Comment

Plan response

**PP16 PP.16 requires developers of the strategic housing sites to contribute to the costs of these measures.**

- 14 Yes
- 17 Agree
- 19 hmmm... smacks of bribery! Why not require them to be included in the development plans?
- 20 Agree & the train company should also contribute.
- 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.
- 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.
- 32 Definitely
- 33 Agree
- 35 I agree.
- 36 and actually implement these measures under contract to Network Rail where appropriate.

Response	Policy	Comment	Plan response
	<b>PP17</b>	<b>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.</b>	
14		Agree. These should be developed into aesthetic or recreational amenities (i.e. ponds and streams)	
17		Very concerned about the knock-on effect of these developments on flooding of the area including the railway.	
18		Support	
19		agree though 'sustainable' is an ill defined term with no definitive 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.	
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.  
 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.  
 32 Agree  
 33 Agree  
 35 I agree.  
 36 I agree.

Response	Policy	Comment	Plan reponse
	<b>PP18</b>	<b>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.</b>	
14		Yes	
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?	
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 a sit 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.

Response	Policy	Comment	Plan reponse
	<b>CA13</b>	<b>CA.13 commits RPC to working with Thames Water to ensure that appropriate priority is given to maintaining and upgrading the existing sewerage network.</b>	
14		Yes	
17		Agree	
18		Support	
19		agree	
20		Agree.	
23		Supported	
25		Agree	
26		Yes but the developers must pay.	
27		Agreed particularly given the numerous recent issues with the sewers	
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 sewerage network fit for purpose	
30		agree	
31		Absolutely, but again should be the responsibility of higher authorities than RPC.	
32		Very important given the existing problems.	
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.	

Response Policy Comment Plan response

**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.**

- 14 Yes
- 17 Agree
- 18 Support.
- 19 phone masts to be unobtrusive/disguised..
- 20 Agree.
- 23 Supported
- 25 Agree
- 26 yes but be sensitive to people and nature.
- 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.
- 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
- 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?

Response	Policy	Comment	Plan reponse
	<b>CA15 &amp; CA16</b>	<b>CA15 &amp; 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 &amp; 16 support these policies.</b>	
14		Yes	
17		Very concerned about the loss of habitat to wildlife in general and specifically to skylarks nesting in South Kennington Site field.	
18		Support. This will also be helped by ensuring new developments are not built to 3-storey heights.	
19		agree	

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 thrip 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.  
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.  
31 I agree.  
32 Important  
33 Agree  
35 I agree. I would also welcome local co-operation to make hedgehog-friendly routes between back gardens.  
36 I support these aims.

### **Any Other points**

1 All other proposals we agree with as drafted  
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.  
I support the speed limit on Kennington Road between Sugworth Lane and Park End Farm should be reduced (it is currently national speed limit)  
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.

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 Fates, 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.

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.

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 loses. Its now a very depressing situation.

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?

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..

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

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.

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.

- 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.  
I would advocate improved pedestrian infrastructure throughout the village in particular along foxborough road, where pedestrians are in dangerous lay 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.
- 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.)  
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?
- 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.
- 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?  
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?

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 buliding programmes without taking any responsibility for the consequences and without looking for other solutions to housing problems.

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!

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.

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.