

## WNP Public Consultation, 08 May – 30 June 2017.

### Responses 4

## Consultation with Wheatley and Holton Parish Councils

WNP Committee members attended the Annual Meetings of both civil Parishes, Wheatley 03 May 2017 (John Fox and Roy Gordon) and Holton 25 May 2017 (John Fox, Simon Shew and Mike Vaughton).

A small WNP display was mounted at the Wheatley Meeting and platform time was allocated to WNP at both Meetings. WPC held a private meeting with WNP on 20 June 2017 which lasted from 7.30 to 10.00 p.m. Robert Barter, Chairman of HPC, attended this meeting. WNP were represented by John Fox, Roy Gordon and Andrew Johnson.

### A. Holton Parish Council Responses.

#### Robert Barter, Chairman, 22 June.

1. Mistaken wording, para 1.4 'proposing [OBU development] instead [of Wheatley development]'. OBU was made a strategic site unrelated to Wheatley's exemption.
2. Sewerage capacity mention is lacking, and should recur in Vision/Objectives. Capacity needed for new housing.
3. Fig 6.2 p 25, WHE 25A has not been listed.
4. Confusion over 'area of built form' which is 6.5 hectares, not 12.11 hectares. Para 7.6 and 9.6 are incorrect ('the part within the WNP area is designated brownfield site').
5. 9.8 'currently' should be removed.
6. p.44, Policy SP2 WHE 25, note that 12.11 hectares is the size of the OBU site in the WNP area – the whole site is 21 hectares.
7. Links are needed with Holton, too, not only Wheatley. Where could an A40 bridge 'land' in Wheatley ?

#### Holton Parish Council, 29 June

1. PC disputes stated extent(s) of 'built form': '12.11 hectares (para 7.6). HPC insist that is the OBU site extent on the WNP map, but the 'built form' is actually only 6.5 hectares. The remainder (5.6 hectares) is playing fields, 2 gardens and properties on Waterperry Rd (25A) plus trees ponds and amenity land.
2. 'Currently' in 9.8, please remove.
3. No mention of integrating the development with Holton. See STRAT 10 pp.45/6, LP2033, 'vehicular, cycle, pedestrian access, incl. safe and attractive connections with nearby communities'. We request e.g. access to Holton along field boundary by Church, to exit by village hall. HPC prepared to negotiate this with developer.

#### Roger Farrow, HPC Councillor LETTER C (letters A 10 April, B 23 April, C 28 June)

1. Evidence Base needs better linking to claims and policies.
2. Map needed of Wheatley Green Belt and of Conservation Area.
3. Evidence shows that 'less than half' Wheatley and Holton favour housing on OBU site.
4. p.19 Vision HL1V, Obj. HL101 are contradictory. Promotes all tenures, save for buy-to-let. Not relevant to an NP, so should be removed.
5. p.20. Vision HL2V. There is no clear plan of the OBU built-up area. A new plan of the built-up area is needed and this Vision to be cross-referenced to it.
6. HL2V Obj HL305, need stronger wording for height reduction, e.g. 'Low Rise/' or /max. 3 storey.
7. p.27, 7.6. 'built form' is not 12.11 hectares. That is the WNP area. Built form is half that, and

the rest is 'undeveloped green space' (5.2 hectares). Replace '**this part of**' with '**The WNP would expect the whole of the site would be retained as Green Belt**'.

8. Policy H1, size of area WHE 25-OBU Built Form again is wrong at 12.11 ha. It should be 6.9 ha.
9. p.36. 8.16. Weight restriction on Flyover would turn HGVs back into Holton. Revise or remove.
10. 9.8. Remove word 'currently'
11. 'OBU is primarily related to Wheatley' is unfounded. It is in Holton, separated from Wheatley by A40 and has only a single minor road connection to Wheatley. 'Mitigation of impacts' on Wheatley must also apply to Holton.
12. Policy SP2-WHE 25- OBU Site. The OBU site and WNP Map area, brownfield site and built up area are confused. OBU site is the Campus. The WNP Area is just the 'study area' not the Built up area. SP2 refers to 'the OBU site' which is larger than the 12.11 ha. quoted. Policy SP2 is meant to apply to 'built up area' and not to 'OBU site' as stated.
13. Above Policy (I) refers to integration of new development with Wheatley. As it is in Holton, integration with Holton should be included. e.g. footpath to village hall and church.

*Roger Farrow sent earlier letters A and B, 10 April and 23 April, before the draft Consultation WNP was published in early May. He had seen only an earlier draft dated 22 February.*

#### **Letter B from RF, 10 April**

- a) stronger language needed in HL 304 to ensure High Rise Tower is not replaced by anything higher than 'Low Rise'.
- b) HL2V (p.17, 7 sites in Green Belt to be developed: nil to show HL20 that these 'do not meet the functions of GB'. It is 'just the opinions of some'. Beware the wording, though I do support the development of some sites.
- c) What is 'built up area' ? See Letter C, 12, above. p.29, 12.11 hectares used to describe 'brownfield site'. This is wrong: only 6.9 hectares is built up
- d) delete 'currently' in 9.8. Add Holton for 'mitigation'.
- e) 8.19 infers that WPC gets CIL money. Not true. Similarly at 10.2
- f) site is subject of outline Planning App. Primarily for housing'. No such application.
- g) Fig 8.2, should show two view points – OBU – Holton - OBU, to show elevation.
- h) 8.16 weight restriction on Flyover would turn HGVs into Holton.

#### **Letter C from RF, 23 April.**

Two new introductory paragraphs are needed, '1.3 and 1.4,' to explain why OBU is in WNP and why only half the site. Derived from Local Green Belt Study, SODC Sept 2015, part of OBU site 'tightly drawn around built form to avoid taking in open land. To allow 'future development without harm to purposes of Green Belt'. 'Subsequent discussion in 2016' extended this to WHE 25A [*sic*], owned by OBU, but not part of OBU Campus itself. A new para 1.4 would state the requirement for the full participation of Holton PC in consultations and final voting.

#### **From Cllr Allan East, 20 June,**

Matters of concern in short:

- a) area for development is the footprint, not the 12+ ha. which is mentioned in WNP.
- b) numbers should be clearly around 300.
- c) 'currently' in phrase 'Brookes site currently in Holton' (9.8)

**Summary by John Fox, Chairman WNP.**

*I thank Holton PC for their responses. Of course WNP will recommend better access from the site to Holton (and the Village Hall). I wish it had been raised earlier, but the limits of the NP Area Map have conditioned us all. All of our Draft language will need re-visiting, but advisory discussions with SODC begin only on 10 August. The need for clarity about what is and what is not permissible development land on the site is shared by all involved. This lack of clarity has persisted since LP 2032 was published in May 2016. A range of 'site' definitions, descriptions, and different interpretations of the sub-measurements within those definitions, has grown since. WHE 25A also needs clarifying. A definitive judgement from SODC, as Planning authority, is needed.*

**John Fox.**

## **B. Wheatley Parish Council Responses**

*The main meeting between WNP and WPC, on 20 June 2017, was attended by Robert Barter, Chairman of HPC. It lasted 2.5 hours, but was 'private', therefore recorded only informally and that by WNP. However, it remained a statutorily required meeting, which followed a routine WPC meeting. Toby Newman [SODC Councillor and WNP Committee member] took notes for much of the meeting. John Fox recorded the rest after Toby left for a birthday celebration. By that date, OCC as the Strategic Authority still had ten days in which to respond to the Draft WNP in Public Consultation. That response came on 30 June, at the end of Public Consultation. SODC, the Planning authority, postponed Response for a further month, until 27 July. This Parish Discussion was therefore held without either of these crucial County or District responses to inform.*

### **FIRST RESPONSE TO DRAFT WHEATLEY NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN**

**Anne Davies, Chairwoman, WPC, 5 June 2017**

Thank you to those involved with the WNP for all their hard work and dedication in producing the Draft report. The following comments are based on my reading of the Draft, obviously without being party to all the discussions and analyses that has taken place over the past eighteen months. I appreciate that my points have likely been discussed and documented before but I didn't see it in the document and I hope you find the comments useful in making the draft accessible to the uninitiated.

#### **Document**

An Index and a Summary is needed.

#### **Sites identified for development**

Generally, each of the potential sites should be discussed regarding their suitability for future usage, e.g. development, green spaces, recreation etc.? The document details the process followed for that analysis but does not detail the decision.

It is disappointing that there are no recommendations for continual development or improvement to the sites listed. The only areas earmarked for housing are those that are already known about, i.e. the site of the Railway and Oxford Brookes.

Brookes – an obvious large scale site. Debate about the number of dwellings (300-600) will continue until Brookes have secured a purchaser. Clearly, any potential buyer is going to want to maximise their investment in the cost of the land and the safe removal of the existing structures.

London Road– WHE1, a, b, c, 2, 3 and 26 to the north. WHE15, 16, 17 to the south. It is

understood all sites are currently within the Green Belt. However, excepting WHE16 currently occupied by the industrial park, ASDA and 6 bungalows, they appear to be potential development sites. These sites should be explored and discussed in the NP to provide an on-going plan for housing as well as responding to wider community concerns such as traffic alleviation, parking, pavements, cycle and footpaths etc.

The suggestion that all light industry would be **happy** to move to WHE16 and that the existing residents on that plot would **happily** relocate elsewhere needs to be qualified as realistic. It is likely to be highly controversial, not to mention costly in terms of incentives and potential impact to the individual businesses. The economic viability needs justification.

### **Open spaces, recreation etc.**

No definitive statements are made about the need for recreation, open spaces and sporting facilities, based on current and future populations.

### **Infrastructure needs and proposals**

Beyond the need for a cycle/footpath flyover to the OBU site, there doesn't appear to be any clear arguments or suggestions to address the high priority issues identified by the surveys, i.e. traffic, parking, roads and pavements.

### **Cllrs Bell and Willmott (on behalf of the WPFT) have submitted their thoughts and the following comments were received from Cllr. Paul Gregory:**

I've read the draft through but I didn't find it easy to follow..... I hope that whatever goes out to the public, in due course, will be better and simpler to understand.

My comments are based on my **own** understanding of the draft document;

I agree that OBU and the Railway site currently provide the best option for additional housing within the village. I'd also like to see the land opposite Maidenhead Aquatics suitably developed, in due course.

I agree that light industries in Littleworth should be relocated elsewhere.....and the land identified near to Asda is a good bet. Also the other pockets of industry/commerce e.g. tyre fitter on Holloway, the car repair shop on London Rd near the Avenue.....both of which create unnecessary parking/congestion issues.....should be similarly relocated.

There's much reference to playing fields and sporting facilities at OBU site that will be given up if/when OBU goes. We, as a Council, are already spending huge amounts of time on discussion about the 'sporting opportunities' at Holton Playing fields and now Littleworth field. With what will become freed up at OBU, I doubt that there can possibly be the market for all this 'playing space'.....there simply isn't enough people wanting to play. I suggest we need to focus and not try to be too clever or greedy or ambitious. We seem to go around in circles over this and I'd suggest there are far more important things we should concentrate on.

If the OBU site ever does go ahead for housing, the increase in traffic flows will effect Wheatley considerably. The report identifies the problems we already face in respect of traffic and parking and noise and pollution. The OBU site will significantly add to this. One issue we should concern ourselves with is traffic **approaching from the East**.....M40, A418 etc.....into OBU or Wheatley. Currently the only way into OBU is via London Rd, then either via Waterperry Rd **OR** over the Holton flyover. If 300 plus dwellings are built on OBU, traffic flow will increase significantly, from the East. What is needed will be a slip road and flyover, coming off the A40 dual carriageway to take traffic into OBU and/or

Wheatley. If not everything will come along London Rd over the bridge at Asda and turn on to Waterperry Rd. These roads simply will not cope with any such increase. Traffic in the village will be worse than ever.

There's little in the report that deals with additional parking provision.....I think that is a must for the final report.

## **Wheatley Neighbourhood Plan Proposed Discussion Points with Parish Councillors from Holton and Wheatley WPC Chairwoman, Anne Davies, 19 June 2017**

- 1. Balance of history and vision:** raised by Anne Davies  
How the vision was arrived at or the longer-term strategy for the village.
- 2. Open Spaces:** raised by Paul Willmott  
In relation to two sections of The National Planning Policy Framework 2012 of which Section 8 is "Promoting Healthy Communities" and the other (9) "Protecting Green Belt land".
- 3. The Policy boxes/statements:** raised by Anne Davies  
Should be highlighted and the content summarised/bulleted to make very clear the transport/environmental requirements of any development. (Examples: pages 29-32 of Chinnor plan; page 14-32 Woodcote)  
Given that the Straw Poll identified traffic, parking, roads and pavements as the primary concern of residents, it would be good to make very clear policy statements that endorse those concerns. (Example Chinnor pages 42-46).
- 4. Weightings applied to public opinion:** raised by Anne Davies  
Understand the weighting of public opinion for some of the vision objectives, e.g. 'SI104 Set aside land to build a larger village hall....' and 'VCI01 Ensure the provision of a public toilet for the village centre'
- 5. Section 7 Assessment of the suitability of the sites for future development.** raised by Anne Davies  
It would be helpful to have a summary of the reasons for rejection of the sites shown on the map (fig. 6.1), beyond the fact that they are in the Green Belt.
- 6. Further proposals.** raised by Anne Davies/Paul Gregory  
It is short-sighted to come up with only three proposals where two of the sites have already been earmarked for development. The third option, i.e. relocating light industry to the east of the village and consideration for appropriate development of the land opposite Maidenhead Aquatics.  
It is naive to expect that all the other parcels of land, particularly those to the east on both sides of the London Road will remain as open spaces into the future. It is a missed opportunity not to define how at least some of the locations could be developed in line with the policies of the plan, including access, traffic, open spaces etc. to suitable housing in the long-term.
- 7. Traffic, vehicles and access**  
The report identifies the problems we already face in respect of traffic and parking and noise and pollution. The OBU site will significantly add to this. One issue we should concern ourselves with is traffic approaching from the East.....M40, A418 etc.....into OBU or Wheatley.  
Currently the only way into OBU is via London Rd, then either via Waterperry Rd OR over the Holton flyover. If 300 plus dwellings are built on OBU, traffic flow will increase significantly,

from the East. What is needed will be a slip road and flyover, coming off the A40 dual carriageway to take traffic into OBU and/or Wheatley. If not everything will come along London Rd over the bridge at Asda and turn on to Waterperry Rd. These roads simply will not cope with any such increase.

Traffic in the village will be worse than ever.

There's little in the report that deals with additional parking provision. Which needs to be addressed in the final version.

8. **Layout and flow** raised by Anne Davies

Improved ease of reading and navigation and to include appendices and summary.

## Wheatley Parish Council extra-Ordinary meeting

<b>Date</b>	Tuesday 20 June 2017
<b>Venue/Time</b>	URC Church Hall

<b>Who</b>	<b>Description</b>
	Accounts
	WNP meeting minutes
	Key actions / questions
	Meeting to review Emerging Neighbourhood Plan
	<b>Introduction - John Fox</b>
<b>JF</b>	<p>Explained why no introduction and index as yet            Public consultation 8 weeks, now 7 weeks            6 is statutory            Open day 17 June, over 250 people            Presented at both Parish meetings            JF <b>OBU/GVA</b> feedback and shared: 60 responses. 4 from Holton            Comments re ground rent @ Mill View</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Littleworth Road comments</li> <li>- Comments ref Park Hill</li> <li>- London Road bungalows – occupants want market value and costs, relocation may not be viable, so decision made to consider WHE16 as in fill</li> </ul> <p>JF commented on focus of West end            JF commented on OBU public consultation            Why Neighbourhood plan Name – this was designated by SODC            JF suggests OBU 300 figures stuck to</p>
	<b>Others comments</b>
<b>TD</b>	Stick to 300? Brookes are in debt?
<b>RG</b>	<p>Explained boundary            Explained communications strategy and plan            Reviewed website statistics            Reviewed key issues etc            Reviewed issues and comments following OBU consultation</p>
<b>RG</b>	<p>Need to see OBU integrated into both communities            Need to talk to individuals            Layout/flow/presentation of the material to be done later            Exec summary/SODC planners advised again</p>

	Readability etc. Agreed feedback to be sought
RG	Vision <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Explained policy workshops – visions/objectives</li> <li>– Covered strategy for vision of development plan</li> </ul>
RG	Explained weighting applied re public opinion
TD	Overall vision? Develop into? – Where we want building to be Village hall research?
GS	Presentation of document / plan to the people – RG explained the process of public meeting before the referendum
R Bell	Disagreed with only considering housing at OBU because of the timescale involved
RG	Explained land use and strategy statements
GS	Asked about location of bigger community hall.
AD	Disappointed about roads etc. Woodcote and Chinnor. WNP to address.
TD	Big issues for economics of Littleworth. Would like statements strengthening
R Bell	OBU timescales
TD	Has someone done sums for relocation. RG explained the need for further discussion with developers and SODC. However first of all it needs to be adopted.
P Bignell	Complicated narrative. Can this be made simpler.
P Gregory	Did you use the High Street Committee figures? High Street figures from NP. RG pointed out that WNP had not seen any report.
P Willmott	Beef up green space
RG	Oxford/Cambridge expressway and potential to migrate. TN advised that mitigation may not be possible
RG	Assessment of land selection and criteria explained
RG	Comments on further questions on sites and why only WHE15 considered and not also WHE2
TN?	Explained about the greenbelt

*CONTINUED:-*

**WPC/WNP Meeting, 20 June 2017, Response to Draft WNP : continued,  
Notes Taken by JF after TN's departure.**

**1. 'Contingency' Sites Discussion:** WNP believe that an allocation would after all be required of Wheatley, were the OBU site not to be sold for housing development, but for a different purpose. It seemed wise to audit what Green Belt areas lay in Wheatley, ahead of any such eventuality. WNP Committee and the community also need to know exactly what comprises Wheatley Green Belt land given that it is so frequently mentioned in LP 2032 and LP 2033. Equally important, it is also a wise stocktaking of Green Belt and other land in Wheatley. (JF)

*[Draft WNP phrase 'sites which could come under consideration' p.24 is ambiguous: needs clarity/re-phrasing. JF]*

There was discussion about why WNP did not consider these sites for other use. SS pointed out that the sites chosen seemed more appropriate. Because of the response of the Bungalow residents, invited and heard during Public Consultation, WNP proposed that WHE 16 be made an 'infill' site.

**2. Open Spaces – Sports Facilities, (PW):** developers should replace lost facilities; and why not a facility on Ms Tombs' field; it should be kept in the community; PW /Sports C'ttee asked for a sports 'vision' (PW) in the revised WNP

**3. Brookes Traffic -** OBU consultants say more 'trip hits' (1800) now than with 600 houses (1200)

**4. Parking.** A Holton detour bus service was abandoned some time ago as unviable. (RBarter)  
Dispute over timing and responsibility, High St and Church Rd Parking surveys (TD/JF).  
(DH/DM and DL in mid-collating. First two happen to be WNP members too.)  
WNP has already provided 'snapshot' surveys of London Rd and Park Hill parking.

**5. Phone masts, OBU tower –** OBU Agent assures that miniaturised versions are now available.

**6. Impact on Holton (with input from Robert Barter, Chairman HPC)**

**a) Integration** of any development (within WNP Area) must be with Holton village (lying outside WNP Area) and not just with Wheatley.

**b) Pathway** needed from OBU site to Holton, otherwise the two remain as separated as now.

**c) Holton PC unhappy** with the 'built form' measured as **12+ hectares**.

**d)** (R.Bell, WPC) – proposed **development is just homes**, without social or retail for 600 homes.

**e) OBU / GVA Agent claims bridge/tunnel across A40 is non-viable**, be it for a 300 home site or a 600 home site. However Wheatley is manifestly the major Local Service Hub as shown in the Draft WNP

**The meeting closed at approximately 10.00 p.m. It was agreed the Draft WNP had been discussed as robustly as possible, in the absence of responses from County and District.**

**John Fox**



## **WPC Chairwoman, Anne Davies, Correspondence with Roy Gordon, vice Chairman WNP and WPC Cllr Roger Bell, 21 – 23 June 2017.**

**1, Chair, Ann Davies.** Question the evidence weighting for non-housing issues (toilets, Community Hall), and not for traffic flow measures, footpaths and pavements. EB Surveys 1, 2, 3, 4 & EB Conversations 1-10, show major consensus is housing and traffic flow/congestion, Church Rd bus route, footpaths. But only 8 mention a Hall and none say Toilets. The only Evidence = 2 Bar Charts 3.1 and 4.2. A Traffic and Parking follow-up was urged by WPC on 20 June. Be specific about developers' requirements or needs at stated sites 'giving named roads and junctions'. No specifics, no notice taken. Be firm about primary concerns of residents otherwise no consensus.

**Vice-Chairman, Roy Gordon.** Toilets and Hall are Land Use, while Roads and Traffic are not, but part of Infrastructure resulting from development.

**WPC Chair 23 June. 4.42.** You are not answering my questions. What weighted evidence have you for Toilets and Hall and against traffic, bus routes and parking? If it is OK to specify Toilets and Hall on negligible feedback, why not about roads and junction blackspots? If you recommend a small area of Ms Tombs' Field be taken out of Gr. Belt, why not the same for other shorter term developments on the S side of London Rd?

**Roger Bell WPC, 5.00 p.m.,** Toilets and Hall are Land use, roads and traffic are not, but part of infrastructure resulting from development.

**Roy Gordon.** Fig 4.2 is from EB4 which is a summary of spreadsheet analysis, Part 5, Community Survey audited by CFO. 'Village Centre, 70% Satisfied, 25% Dissatisfied, 5% No Comment. Only reasons specified for dissatisfaction were 7% pavements and 4% no toilets.' WNP has two Policies for Transport and Parking. T1 demands a Travel Plan for every development. VCE1 specific for Village Centre. P1 relative only to avoiding 'tandem parking'. Without SODC response [July 27] we cannot review our policies.

**Roy Gordon, 6.00 p.m.** Roger Bell is right. Green Belt constraint prevents our commenting on more than Railway and OBU sites. SODC did agree to include LP 2033 to release east of The Avenue from GB. Village reluctant to see GB released. Littleworth would also give some 50-70 houses in a 2 year period, well ahead of OBU's future being known. Infrastructure is a village issue. We included Policy T1 [Travel Plan] as acceptable. Draft WNP places Transport at the top of its list for CIL / and or / S106, in Para 10.2. Without SODC Response to Pub.Con. [or OCC Response, JF] we have to wait to revise Policies.

**Summarised by John Fox, Chairman WNP, August 2017.  
Originals available for inspection**

## **WNP Public Consultation, WPC Response from Cllr Roger Bell**

We can influence the Draft Local Plan [LP2033] before it is determined.

300 homes at OBU is **not** a realistic fair allocation to Wheatley, given that the site is not yet even sold, no housing is likely there in the next 8-10 years, and 300 homes will not be acceptable to OBU Agent [GVA].

The site is always going to be remote from Wheatley and it may in the longer term create a new 'greater Wheatley'.

The village needs more homes, not 300 in a 'sudden splurge', but in 'continuing growth of 20 year.' I disagree with Policies HL105 and 8.22 as a 'ghetto approach'.

I do not accept the 'Contingency Sites' of Policy SP3. These should be our PRIORITY SITES.

Remove WHE 1A, 1B, 2, 3, 15, 16, 17, 21 and 24 from Green Belt status.

There is an overwhelming argument for using Ms Tombs' Field. Not just the 56% WNP Poll, but from [*unspecified*] Evidence in The Past,

The A40 is a 'logical boundary'. Easily get 20 houses a year. Plans already devised. All in line with the rest of WNP criteria.

## **WPC Response from Cllr Ian Roberts**

1. Not easy to read.
2. Full of aspirations, but light on how to achieve them
3. Executive Summary and Evidence Base needed.
4. Evidence Base, only 2 Surveys published. 458 (straw poll) and 670 responses In a village of 4000. These are of limited value. Low responses reduce even that.
5. Evidence Base for further interviews not accessible either.
6. Omits Parking Survey, though performed by those involved in WNP. 'Objective unbiased evidence ... deliberately excluded, making the WNP Draft subjective and biased'.
7. Its vision for the village square does not show how car parking and toilets will make the centre more attractive and pleasant. No evidence is shown for support for either.

'General concern about parking does not provide evidence of a need for it.' The Draft appears biased for whatever reason.

8. Nothing is said about village square ownership, covenants on, or enforcement there. The Draft has '**ignored**' advice from 3 architects and 2 town planners on the Square Improvement committee.
9. OBU: 'WNP was elected to include only Green Belt land that has current buildings on it. The failure to include the entire OBU site has left the Green Belt which does not have houses on it vulnerable to development under the legal clause 'exceptional circumstances' ... 'WNP could be modified to make it more complex to develop 600 homes ... but the Draft fails to do so.
10. Ref. 'understanding' in a written report, I copy one sentence in full:

*'Pavements are modern urban furniture, but villages now face urban-scale traffic'.*

## **WPC Response from Cllr Paul Gregory**

1. Not easy to follow. Make it simpler to understand.
2. Support for Ms Tombs' Field being 'suitably developed in due course'. OBU and Railway sites best option for additional housing in village.
3. Agree to relocate light industries from Littleworth ... near ASDA is a good bet ...

and other pockets of industry e.g. Holloway tyre fitters, Car Repair shop London Rd, opposite The Avenue

4. Re potential loss of playing fields and sporting facilities at OBU. Is there a market for all this 'playing space' ... 'or enough people wanting to play?' We seem to go round in circles over this and we should concentrate on far more important things'.
5. If OBU housing proposals go ahead, increased traffic flow will affect Wheatley considerably. Draft WNP identifies parking, traffic, noise and pollution. OBU housing will add to this significantly. We should concern ourselves with traffic coming from the East (A40, A418) into OBU or Wheatley. London Rd is the only ay into OBU, via either Waterperry Rd or Holton Flyover. 300+ dwellings on OBU site will increase traffic flow considerably from the East. A slip road and flyover is needed, coming off the A40 dual carriageway to take traffic into OBU and / or Wheatley. Otherwise everything will use London Rd over the old bridge at ASDA and then onto the Waterperry Rd [*via Old London Rd*]. These roads simply will not cope with any such increase. Traffic in the village will be worse than ever.
6. Little in this report deals with additional parking provisiuon. A **must** for the final report.

Responses from Cllrs Willmott [*speaking for the WPFT*] and Bell have been recorded above, or incorporated in WPC Chair's Discussion Points sent out for 5 June and 20 June 2017. Both councillors have also corresponded with the WNP Committee directly.

**Summarised by John Fox, Chairman WNP, August 2017.  
Originals available to view.**