

Examination of West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2031

Matters and Questions for Stage 3

Introductory Notes

Hearing Statements and requests to participate in Stage 3 hearings

Hearing statements prepared in response to these questions should accord with the requirements set out in paragraphs 27 and 28 of the March 2017 Examination Guidance Note, Updated for Stages 2 and 3. In summary, statements must not exceed 3000 words per Matter (and many will not need to be as long as this) and participants should only answer the questions of direct relevance to their previously-submitted representations on the plan.

Three paper copies and an electronic copy of hearing statements should be submitted to the Programme Officer (contact details in the Examination Guidance Notes) between 9 and 16 June 2017, the absolute deadline being **12:00 on Friday 16 June 2017**. Requests to take part in a Stage 3 hearing session should be made to the Programme Officer by **12:00 on Friday 9 June 2017**. Participants who have already registered their wish to participate in Stage 3 hearings should reconfirm their wish and, having regard to the Matters and Questions below, indicate the hearing session(s) they ideally wish to attend. Every effort will be made to accommodate these requests and all participants who have submitted a duly-made representation seeking a change to the plan, and who wish to be heard, will be invited to a hearing session.

Examination of soundness of the plan and 'Omission' Sites

I am examining the soundness of the plan as proposed by the Council and not the merits of specific sites not allocated for development in the plan. The robustness of the housing site selection process employed in formulating the plan is being considered in Stage 2 of the Examination and I will be reaching conclusions on the adequacy of the supply of housing as part of Stage 3. If, at any point in the Examination, I conclude that it is necessary for alternative or additional development sites to be allocated in the plan it is likely that a pause or suspension in the Examination would be necessary in the first instance for the Council to consider how best to respond to these concerns.

Housing Land Supply Position Statement

The Council intends to publish, on the Examination website, its Housing Land Supply Position Statement, updated to 1 April 2017 by no later than 5 May 2017. In responding to the questions set out below, participants are encouraged to have regard to this updated statement.

Matter 11 – Witney Sub-Area

(Policies WIT1, WIT2, WIT2a, WIT2b, WIT3 and WIT4)

- 11.1 Is the Witney Sub-Area Strategy (policy WIT4), including in relation to employment land (ie 20ha to the west of Witney) and transport proposals, positively prepared, justified and effective?
- 11.2 Is the Witney Town Centre Strategy (policy WIT3) positively prepared, justified and effective?
- 11.3 Are the following housing allocations soundly-based; are the policy criteria set out in the relevant policies justified and effective; and are the assumptions relating to viability and delivery within the next five years and across the plan period as a whole realistic?
 - East Witney Strategic Development Area (WIT1)
 - North Witney Strategic Development Area (WIT2)
 - Woodford Way Car Park, Witney (WIT2a)
 - Land West of Minster Lovell (WIT2b)

Matter 12 – Carterton Sub-Area

(Policies CA1, CA1a, CA1b, CA2 and CA3)

- 12.1 Is the Carterton Sub-Area Strategy (policy CA3), including in relation to employment land, positively-prepared, justified and effective?
- 12.2 Is the Carterton Town Centre Strategy (policy CA2) positively-prepared, justified and effective?
- 12.3 Are the following housing allocations soundly-based; are the policy criteria set out in the relevant policies justified and effective; and are the assumptions relating to viability and delivery within the next five years and across the plan period as a whole realistic?
 - REEMA North and Central (CA1)
 - Land at Milestone Road, Carterton (CA1a)
 - Land at Swinbrook Road, Carterton (CA1b)

Matter 13 – Chipping Norton Sub-Area

(Policies CN1 and CN2)

- 13.1 Is the Chipping Norton Sub-Area Strategy (policy CN2) positively prepared, justified and effective?

13.2 Is the Land East of Chipping Norton Strategic Development Area soundly-based; are the criteria set out in policy CN1 justified and effective; and are the assumptions relating to viability and housing delivery within the next five years and across the plan period as a whole realistic?

Matter 14 – Eynsham - Woodstock Sub-Area

(Policies EW1, EW1a, EW1b, EW1c, EW1d, EW1e, EW1f, EW1g, EW1h and EW2)

14.1 Is the Eynsham - Woodstock Sub-Area Strategy (policy EW2) positively prepared, justified and effective?

14.2 Is policy EW1 concerning Blenheim World Heritage Site justified, effective and consistent with national policy?

14.3 Are the following housing allocations soundly-based; are the policy criteria set out in the relevant policies justified and effective; and are the assumptions relating to viability and delivery within the next five years and across the plan period as a whole realistic?

- West Eynsham Strategic Development Area (EW1b)
- Land at East of Woodstock (EW1c)
- Land north of Hill Rise, Woodstock (EW1d)
- Land north of Banbury Road, Woodstock (EW1e)
- Land at Myrtle Farm, Long Hanborough (EW1f)
- Land at Oliver's Garage, Long Hanborough (EW1g)
- Former Stanton Harcourt Airfield (EW1h)

14.4 Is the West Oxfordshire Garden Village Strategic Development Area (policy EW1a), including its housing, science park and transport infrastructure elements, based on robust evidence and justified and effective. Are the assumptions relating to viability and delivery of the development realistic?

Matter 15 – Burford - Charlbury Sub Area

(Policies BC1, BC1a, BC1b, BC1c, BC1d)

15.1 Is the Burford - Charlbury Sub-Area Strategy (policy BC1) positively prepared, justified and effective?

15.2 In respect of the following housing allocations:

- (a) is it likely that they would accord with the requirement of national policy that major development in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty is only approved in exceptional circumstances?

(b) Are they, otherwise, soundly-based; are the policy criteria set out in the relevant policies justified and effective; and are the assumptions relating to viability and delivery within the next five years and across the plan period as a whole realistic?

- Land north of Woodstock Road, Stonesfield (BC1a)
- Land east of Burford (BC1b)
- Land north of Jefferson's Piece, Charlbury (BC1c)
- Land south of Milton Road, Shipton under Wychwood (BC1d)

Matter 16 – Five Year Supply of Deliverable Housing Land

16.1 Is it appropriate for the plan to have separate housing requirement figures for West Oxfordshire's own housing needs and for the unmet needs of Oxford City? Would such an approach have any practical benefit? Should there instead be a single housing requirement figure for the plan reflecting both needs?

16.2 In determining the five year housing requirement figure:

- Is it appropriate for the shortfall in housing delivery in the early years of the plan period to be addressed over the remainder of the plan period (ie the "Liverpool" method)?
- Is it appropriate to use a 5% 'buffer' in the calculating the housing requirement figures?

16.3 Overall, is there convincing evidence to demonstrate that:

- (a) There are sufficient specific and deliverable housing sites to provide a supply of housing land of at least five years' requirement?
- (b) There are sufficient specific developable sites, or broad locations for growth to meet the plan period housing requirement?

And in particular:

- Does the overall supply of housing land place too much reliance of large, strategic sites?
- Does the overall supply of housing land place too much reliance on sites which will not deliver until after 2021?
- Is it feasible to deliver the 2750 homes which the plan proposes to provide in connection with Oxford City's unmet needs in the ten year period 2021-2031?
- Is it appropriate to include C2 residential development in the housing supply figures?