

# **Radley Parish Council Draft Neighbourhood Plan Consultation**

## **Response from the Owners of Gooseacre Farm, Radley**

### **CONTENTS**

|                      |   |
|----------------------|---|
| <b>Page 2 - 3</b>    | <b>Executive Summary</b>  |
| <b>Pages 4 - 7</b>   | <b>Introduction</b>   |
| <b>Pages 8 - 10</b>  | <b>The Case for the Development of<br/>Radley South</b>                 |
| <b>Pages 11 - 12</b> | <b>Allocation of Sites</b>  |
| <b>Pages 13 - 29</b> | <b>Specific Responses to the Draft<br/>Neighbourhood Plan Questions</b> |
| <b>Page 30</b>       | <b>Conclusion</b>   |

## 1. Executive Summary

- 1.1. We are responding to the draft Radley Parish Council (RPC) Neighbourhood Plan (NP) in our capacity as owners of Gooseacre Farm, Thrupp Lane, Radley.
- 1.2. The northern section of Gooseacre Farm (known as “Radley South”) was identified by the Vale of the White Horse District Council (VWHDC) in its 2015 Green Belt Review as suitable for removal from the Green Belt. This was included in VWHDC’s subsequent draft Local Plan Part 1 (LPPt1) proposals.
- 1.3. Following public examination the Planning Inspector did not accept that the special circumstances existed at that time to justify Radley South being removed from the Green Belt. He did acknowledge that the site was suitable for development if those special circumstances could be demonstrated.
- 1.4. Our promoters, Arnold White Estates Ltd (AWE), have resubmitted Radley South to be considered for allocation in Part 2 of the Local Plan (LPPt2). They have engaged with RPC and the NP Committee to establish how the development of Radley South could have beneficial outcomes for Radley Village.
- 1.5. We are surprised, therefore, that Radley South is not mentioned in the draft NP as a possible development site. We believe that this is an error, given that the VWHDC LPPt2 now has to allocate 3,162 homes in its area, including 2,200 being its share of Oxford’s Unmet Housing Need. The Housing White Paper published only this week requires *“neighbourhoods to demonstrate that their site allocations and housing supply policies will meet their share of housing need”*. Against this backdrop the NP offers sites for 20 - 25 houses (only .03% of VWHDC’s housing need). Radley South can accommodate up to 240 homes (7.6% of the requirement)
- 1.6. We believe that Radley South should be included and given serious consideration in the NP because:
  - It will add weight to the NP by proactively helping to address in a reasonable manner at least some of VWHDC’s increase in unmet housing need
  - Radley South has already been identified by VWHDC’s independent review as suitable for removal from the Green Belt and recognised as such by the Planning Inspector

- The special circumstances now exist for its removal from the Green Belt because of the dramatic increase in housing need, which has to be resolved in LPPT2
- Radley South is within close walking distance of the main line station, with direct connections to Oxford and London. It will therefore not add to the traffic congestion or on/off road parking problems associated with Radley Station
- If Radley South is allocated for development, as owners of Gooseacre Farm we would release additional land alongside the village for the provision of community facilities such as a modern village hall, new sports pitches, enlarged allotments, playground etc
- This development would enable RPC to realise its vision to create a new village hub on the central allotments site, which it currently owns. This will generate valuable income for RPC.
- The development of Radley South would almost double the public funds that could be made available to RPC to realise many of its aspirations as outlined in the NP. A joint programme harnessing the resources of RPC and all the developers might achieve some or all of the following:
  - The extension of Thrupp Lane through to Audlett Drive
  - Improved traffic management (possibly a roundabout) at the junction of Foxborough Road with White's Lane and Thrupp Lane
  - Additional facilities for the primary school
  - Expanded medical facilities
  - A central village commercial hub
  - Improved cycle and pedestrian access throughout the village, including the Sustrans 5 route
  - A relocated, modern village hall with parking
  - New sports pitches
  - Enlarged allotments
  - New playground

1.7. Our promoters, AWE, are willing to work with RPC on our behalf to help achieve the common goal of ensuring Radley remains a highly desirable place to live for years to come. To that end and for these reasons we believe that Radley South should be included as a potential development site in the RPC NP.

## 2. Introduction

- 2.1. This document has been drawn up by the owners of Gooseacre Farm, Thrupp Lane, Radley, in response to the draft Neighbourhood Plan (NP) published in December 2016 by Radley Parish Council (RPC). We therefore openly declare a vested interest in the contents of the NP.

The owners (we) are:

Mr Jonathan Dockar-Drysdale  
Mrs Theresa Colton

- 2.2. Gooseacre Farm has been owned by our family for at least five generations. We ourselves both grew up at Pumney Farm, Lower Radley. Theresa Colton was married in Radley Church and two of her children were baptised there. Our father's ashes have been laid to rest in Radley Cemetery. We became the owners of Gooseacre Farm on the death of our parents, and it has continued to be farmed in the same manner since that time. We have also continued to let out a section of Gooseacre Farm as a football pitch to Radley Youth Football Club, an amenity which has been made available to the village for over 20 years.
- 2.3. Our promoters, Arnold White Estates Ltd (AWE), through their planning consultants Geoff Gardner Planning (GG), have already submitted their own professional response to the draft RPC NP document. This response, however, summarises our own thoughts and responses as owners of Gooseacre Farm, Thrupp Lane. It is not intended to repeat verbatim all the points raised by GG in their response, but

it should be read in conjunction with that document. If there is any repetition between the two submissions on any particular points, this should be taken to emphasise the importance of those matters raised.

- 2.4. We were made aware early in February 2015 that the appointed landscape consultants of Vale of the White Horse District Council (VWHDC) had undertaken a Green Belt review. We had no prior knowledge of this review, and certainly we were not consulted on it. Unexpectedly, we were contacted by no less than 3 housebuilders expressing an interest in the land.
- 2.5. One of the recommendations arising from that review, and incorporated into the subsequent VWHDC Draft Local Plan Part 1 (LPt1), was that the northern section of Gooseacre Farm (called in the Local Plan and subsequently in this response “Radley South”) should be removed from the Green Belt.
- 2.6. Therefore, we appointed a firm of established and respected Promoters, Arnold White Estates Ltd (AWE), to represent our interests. Our instructions to AWE were clear and concise:
  - To maximise the development potential of Radley South, in line with the recommendations set out in the draft VWHDC LPt1.
  - To explore any beneficial opportunities for Radley Village that might arise from any such development.
- 2.7. As part of this process, on our behalf AWE have consistently attempted to involve Radley Parish Council (RPC) and the NP Committee in their proposals for Radley South. This fact is substantiated on the RPC website, where the minutes of

a meeting held as early as November 2015 between AWE and RPC are recorded, in which it clearly states:

*“GG (Geoff Gardner) said that he had met the Radley site land owners, with the AWE Chief Executive, and believed they are a family with local connections and that, while keen to eventually sell the land for development, the family had a concern to do the right thing for Radley.”*

*IF (Ian Foll of AWE) said that he totally understood this concern. While his company was more used to working in control as the single landowner, he could see the value of working with Radley College and the Neighbourhood Plan Committee to support an integrated plan and agreed priorities for infrastructure”*

- 2.8. AWE represented Radley South on our behalf at the LPpt1 public examination. Representatives of RPC, along with CPRE and others, voiced their opposition to any sites being removed from the Green Belt around Radley.
- 2.9. Because VWHDC had not allocated Radley South as a strategic site, the Planning Inspector concluded that the extenuating circumstances did not exist at that time for Radley South to be removed from the Green Belt. However, in his report he did specifically identify Radley South as being suitable for development if those circumstances were to change.
- 2.10. We are aware that AWE remained talking to RPC and the NP Chair, as well as Radley College, throughout the LPpt1 process. It is fair to say that all parties to these discussions recognised the benefit of co-ordinating any final development that might be imposed upon Radley Village. Combining funds within an integrated investment plan would maximise the potential rewards for the village. However, it is also fair to say that RPC and the NP

committee have consistently remained opposed to further development in or around Radley Village, including on the Radley South site.

- 2.11. AWE, on our behalf, has resubmitted Radley South for consideration in Part 2 of the Local Plan (LP Pt2). We understand that VWHDC's Preferred Options for LP Pt2 are due to be published in March 2017.
- 2.12. We therefore intend simply to emphasise two points about the content of the NP, and then provide specific responses to the individual questions posed by RPC in their formal Response Document.

### 3. The Case for the Development of Radley South

- 3.1. It is generally accepted that there is currently a housing crisis in UK. This was summed up nationally in a speech given by The Honourable Savid Javid MP, Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government in October 2016, in which he said

*“In the last year of full records, we managed to deliver more than 170,000 additional properties across England. It’s not a bad number but it is far fewer than we need. We need to do much better. Everyone agrees we need to build more homes. But too many of us object to them being built next to us”*

- 3.2. More recently, the Housing White Paper confirms that:

*“Tackling the housing shortage won’t be easy. It will inevitably require some tough decisions. But the alternative is a divided nation, with an unbridgeable and ever-widening gap between the property haves and have-nots”*

It goes on to say:

*“The Government asks communities to accept that more housing is needed if future generations are to have the homes they need at a price they can afford”.*

- 3.3. As set out in great detail in AWE’s response to the NP, VWHDC needs locally to allocate a further 3,162 homes in Part 2 of the Local Plan (LPpt2). This includes the Vale’s share of Oxford’s Unmet Housing Need of 2,200 homes, which has only been agreed since the LPpt1 public examination.

- 3.4. Despite this national and local housing crisis, the draft RPC NP proposes a net contribution of just 20 - 25 homes in addition to those already allocated in LPPt1, amounting to just 0.03% of the VWHDC's current requirements.
- 3.5. Radley has been identified in LPPt1 and by the Planning Inspector as one of the most sustainable village communities in VWHDC area, with direct rail links into London and Oxford. This small contribution therefore fails to address the scale of the housing problem faced both nationally and locally. By ignoring reality, we believe that the draft NP is in danger of being seen as irrelevant in the context of the current Local Plan process.
- 3.6. We believe that, in 4.2. of the NP (Sites for Development) Radley NP's share of the housing burden allocated in LPPt1 is confusingly exaggerated by including an allocation (North Abingdon - 390 homes) which, by its own admission, is outside the area of the NP itself. Even the allocation for South Kennington (270 homes) is more an extension of South Kennington rather than of Radley Village.
- 3.7. This fact is recognised by RPC's own document "Housing Requirements for Strategic Sites - Sep 2016" which clearly states:
- "The Radley sites will of course also be serving the needs of neighbouring parishes with much larger populations, including Abingdon and Kennington"*
- 3.8. We are advised that Radley South can accommodate up to 240 homes (amounting to 7.6% of VWHDC's total requirement). In these circumstances, given that the Planning Inspector has already acknowledged Radley South's suitability for development, it is highly likely that he will agree that the extenuating circumstances do now exist for Radley South to be allocated for development in LPPt2.

- 3.9. Indeed even the NP accepts in principle that sites can be removed from the Green Belt under exceptional circumstances by actively promoting development on the Old Coal Yard site.
- 3.10. The fact that Radley South is not mentioned anywhere in the NP would seem to suggest that there are so many compelling reasons in favour of its development that the clear intention of the NP is to avoid this outcome by not mentioning it at all. In our opinion, this singular omission only serves to undermine the validity of the NP.
- 3.11. In the context of the national and local housing deficit outlined above, therefore, the case for the development of Radley South is a strong one. The fact that it is not even considered in the NP questions the status of the Plan as a serious contribution to the local professional planning process. This is highly regrettable, as there is much in the document that is commendable and should be adopted by the Local Plan.

#### 4. Allocation of Sites

4.1. In Section 4.2. (Page 14) the NP lists only those sites in the NP area where “*limited opportunities*” exist for development. It is stated that these include:

- Those already allocated in LPpt1
- The Old Coal Yard, Thrupp Lane
- The Allotments (owned by Radley Parish Council)
- The J Curtis Industrial Estate, Thrupp Lane (Commercial)
- “***Last and for completeness***” the Park & Ride site proposed for Lodge Hill

4.2. This is a somewhat misleading statement. Radley South has been identified by the VWHDC as suitable for removal from the Green Belt and it is available for development. The Planning Inspector acknowledged that the site would be suitable for development if the special circumstances arose to justify its removal from the Green Belt. These now clearly exist.

4.3. AWE, at our specific request, have made continued attempts to engage with RPC and the NP Committee, to see how the development of Radley South could open up opportunities for improving the infrastructure and amenity provision within the village.

4.4. Despite this engagement, however, Radley South is conspicuous by its absence from the draft NP document. The potential benefits to the village arising from development of this site are not even considered in the NP. This is disappointing to say the least.

4.5. The failure to mention Radley South in the NP village questionnaire, the results of which underpin the actual NP itself, has left the village unaware of the possible benefits that such a development could offer the community.

4.6. The subsequent omission of Radley South as a potential site in the NP itself fails to place all the options on the table. It thus avoids offering local residents the opportunity to consider for themselves what is realistic in the context of the critical national and local housing need. It fails to consider what long term benefits could accrue for the village community from any such development if they embraced their fair share of that housing need in a managed and holistic manner.

## 5. Specific Responses to the Draft Neighbourhood Plan Questions

- 5.1. Whilst at risk of repeating points made above or by AWE in their submission, we believe that it is only right to include specific answers to the individual questions posed in RPC's NP Response Form. The NP questions are highlighted in red, with our answers/comments following in black:

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.

### Comment:

The NP has no authority to recommend any sites for removal from the Green Belt, as this is clearly a Local Authority matter.

The rationale behind this particular NP statement would seem to suggest that landowners should allow their property in the Green Belt to become run down and an eyesore, as that in itself would justify the special circumstances for its removal from the Green Belt.

There is no other clear reason stated how this site has been appraised, or indeed why it is preferred for removal from the Green Belt compared to other potential development sites within the NP area.

Radley South, almost opposite this site on Thrupp Lane and directly connected to the village, is not mentioned at all. Yet it was actually recommended for removal from the Green Belt by an independent review by VWHDC's own appointed landscape consultants, and included in the VWHDC's Draft LPt1 recommendations.

Whilst the Planning Inspector did not accept that the special circumstances existed at that time for Radley South to be removed from the Green Belt, he did acknowledge that it would be suitable for development. Yet the NP fails entirely to mention this possibility.

The Housing White Paper published this week does seek to maintain the protection of the Green Belt. It confirms the current arrangements and makes it clear that:

*“authorities should amend Green Belt boundaries only when they can demonstrate that they have examined fully all other reasonable options for meeting their identified development requirements”.*

In LPPt1 VWHDC demonstrated to the Planning Inspector that it has indeed already examined all other options, which is why he approved for Radley North West and other sites in the Green Belt to be allocated for housing. Nothing has changed over the last year to alter that situation other than that VWHDC now has to find an additional 3,162 homes in LPPt2.

In the circumstances it stands to reason that Radley South is at least likely to be allocated in this round. The NP will be a more robust planning document, therefore, if it recognises this and proposes ways in which the resulting benefits can be maximised for the community.

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.

**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).

**Comment:**

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.

We would support the comments posted by a parishioner on the RPC website, who says:

*“There will certainly be more customers as the village grows. So I think that the forthcoming Radley Neighbourhood Plan should include a new Village Shop, to be paid for in part by the levy on the developers. This new shop should be two or three times as big as the present shop, which would allow space for a post office counter, a small coffee shop and more space for selling those extra things that we would like, but which can’t be fitted into the present small space.”* - Martin Wilson, Lower Radley

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.

This section of Gooseacre Farm could also provide a suitable location for a modern village hall and associated

parking, convenient for the village but at a sufficient separation to ensure minimal disturbance to residents.

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

**PP3. Inappropriate development outside the built-up area of the village will not be approved except in very special circumstances.**

**Comment:**

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.

The Housing White Paper sets out to strengthen the NP process, as it records the fact that:

*“Those plans in force that plan for a housing number have on average planned for approximately 10% more homes*

*than the number set for that area by the relevant planning authority”*

Unfortunately, the same cannot be said for RPC’s NP. The NP in its present form therefore fails to provide realistic options to meet the Local Authority’s commitment. With its main line station and good communication links with Oxford and London, Radley has been identified as one of the most sustainable communities within the Local Authority area. It is highly likely that it will be required to accommodate more than just 25 additional homes in Part 2 of the Local Plan.

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 21<sup>st</sup> Century throughout the life of the Local Plan and beyond.

**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.**

**Comment:**

We have no comment to make as we understand that such matters will be decided by the Local Authority at the detailed planning stage. However, we note that the Housing White Paper endorses this approach.

**PP5. Provision of plots of land for self-build on the new sites will be supported.**

**Comment:**

See comment to PP4 above

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

Comment:

No comment

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.

Comment:

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.

Indeed, to quote the comments of two local residents posted on the RPC website:

*"I see the Village hall as an essential facility in Radley. It is home to some established village groups such as Brownies, Guides and the retirement group, as well as offering a venue for regular annual events such as the Village fete and Christmas bazaar. The opportunity to join these groups and attend village events is a means of getting to know*

*people, and fosters a sense of belonging. The present Hall is nearly 40 years old and is likely to require substantial repairs, including a new roof, in the next 20 years. A new building could offer new and much improved facilities.*” - Sheila Smith, Little Howe Close

and

*“When there is change in the air, there is always an opportunity to challenge the old ways and come up with potential win/win alternatives. There is also the chance that we miss the window of opportunity and we are left with the worst of all worlds.”* - Mike Wilson, Thrupp Lane

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.

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.

**Comment:**

See our response to PP2 and CA1 above. We thoroughly endorse the development of the central allotment site by RPC, and 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.

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.

**Comment:**

See our responses to PP2, CA1 and CA4 above. We would be willing to identify a suitable site on Gooseacre Farm for this purpose once Radley South is allocated for development in LPPt2.

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

**Comment:**

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.

**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.**

**Comment:**

Agreed.

We own the right of access over the farm track which runs from the Bowyers Arms directly down to the North East Corner of Gooseacre Farm. This would make this central site, and the village hub proposed for the central allotment area, readily accessible on foot or cycle for new residents on the proposed Radley South site.

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.

**Comment:**

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.

PP9. Where replacement sites or buildings are needed for community facilities they should, if practicable, be ready before the old facilities are removed.

**Comment:**

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.

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.

**Comment:**

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

CA8. RPC will press for and support the expansion of nursery facilities at St Swithun's primary school.

**Comment:**

See our response to CA7 above.

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.

**Comment:**

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.

CA9, PP11 and PP12 promote RPC's strategy for the Radley Lakes area.

**Comment:**

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.

PP13 & CA 10 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.

**Comment:**

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.

**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.**

**Comment:**

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.

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.

Comment:

No comment

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.

Comment:

No comment

Resurfacing the road carrying the 35 bus route through Radley and Kennington should be a priority.

Comment:

Agreed

RPC should work with Sustrans and landowners to improve Sustrans Route 5 across the parish.

Comment:

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

Path 8 from White's Lane to Twelve Acre Drive should be improved.

Comment:

No comment

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.

There should be general improvements to cycleways and pavements and provision for secure cycle storage.

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.

Comment:

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.

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.

**Comment:**

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.

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

**Comment:**

We would expect this to be the case in the normal way

**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.**

**Comment:**

We would expect this to be the case in the normal way

**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.**

**Comment:**

We would expect this to be the case in the normal way

CA.13 commits RPC to working with Thames Water to ensure that appropriate priority is given to maintaining and upgrading the existing sewerage network.

**Comment:**

No comment

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.

**Comment:**

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.

This is emphasised in the Housing White Paper, which clearly states:

*“We also want to consider how we can capitalise on new developments, and the digital infrastructure attached to them, to enhance broadband coverage for local communities and nearby residents”.*

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.

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.

**Comment:**

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.

Are there any other points you would like to make about the draft Radley Neighbourhood Plan, not covered in the sections above? If so, please note them below.

**Comment:**

The NP includes section 5.3 on RPC's Funding Strategies and Priorities. It concludes by stating:

*“It is unlikely that there will be enough funding for everything and a gradual phased approach is likely to be needed”*

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.

## 6. Conclusion

- 6.1. We believe that Radley Village, simply because of its geographical location close to Oxford and its railway station, will have to come to terms with its proper share of the local area housing need. As owners of the Radley South site, we remain willing to work with RPC to ensure that this is achieved in a way not solely to accommodate our own aims as landowners but also to safeguard the community in which we grew up, and to which we remain committed.
- 6.2. We therefore recommend that Radley South should be recognised as a potential development site within the NP. We believe that this will meet RPC's need to help address the local unmet housing need in a proactive and responsible manner, which will give serious weight to this plan and encourage its adoption by VWHDC.
- 6.3. In so doing we believe it will create opportunities for ensuring that Radley Village remains a highly desirable and enjoyable community in which to live for many years to come.

Jonathan Dockar-Drysdale  
14 Silver Fox Crescent  
Woodley  
Reading  
Berkshire RG5 3JA

Theresa Colton  
Cann Farm  
Cann  
Shaftesbury  
Dorset SP7 0EF