

Page	Para / reference	Title	Comment/proposed change
9	Q1	Decision making	Not enough clarification of the protection for larger villages
9	Q2	Soundness etc	<p>No.</p> <p>Housing numbers based on SE Plan and not an SHMAA.</p> <p>Infrastructure based on changes to OCC LTP3 SVUK Package which are work in progress and have not be approved at County Level. Plus the evidence presented for parts of the infrastructure is not sound.</p> <p>(Statements in Topic Paper 3, 2.24, 2.26, 2.27, 6.5, 6.6, 6.7 all illustrate the current temporary nature of all conclusions presented in the plan)</p> <p>Employment forecasts do not seem to have any sound basis.</p> <p>Address the issues with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirmed housing numbers based on SHMAA • Agreed Infrastructure based on plans signed off by OCC • Substantiated employment forecasts
9	Q3	Saved policies	See comments on Appendix F
10	Q4	Sustainability Appraisal	No comments – to be honest this is very complex for a lay person
11	Q5	Do you have any comments on Chapter 1?	No, except comments on specific paras
16	1.12	Local Plan Working Groups	<p>The Parish Council welcomes the Local Plan Working Group involving Harwell and Didcot.</p> <p>However, there is no mention of working with SODC to resolve the issues of developments and infrastructure which cross the District Boundary. Working with SODC should be specifically mentioned (and implemented).</p>
17	Q6	Key challenges	

It would be useful to include in this section the map of District Constraints that was presented in the meeting with Parish Councils in Grove.

18 2.4

This should be turned into an action. "We will plan effectively..."

25 After 2.22 Economic Key Challenges

The Parish Council supports the comments from CPRE

The key challenge of reconciling economic growth with environmental and heritage assets are ignored. There should be a dot point early in the list as follows:

- ensuring that economic development does not have adverse impact on the District's natural and built heritage, environment and biodiversity

In the interests of transparency a hidden key challenge – the provision of employment to meet the needs of net inward migration should also be included.

27 After 2.28 Transport key Challenges

The Parish Council supports the comments from CPRE

The second dot point under transport should be strengthened to read:

- continuing to work with partners to address the capacity constraints so as to ensure that new development **does not aggravate** congestion **or worsen** safety on the road network

29 2.34

(Typo, missing full-stop after footnote reference)

There isn't enough in the Plan to help address this issue. Targets for emission reductions should be set.

29 After 2.34 Environment key Challenges

The Parish Council supports the comments from CPRE

The environmental challenges do not refer to the threat of air, light and noise pollution. An additional dot point should be added:

- protecting the Vale, its residents and its communities from further increases in air, light and noise pollution

30 Q7 Spatial vision

3.5 includes “Strategic road improvements will have been implemented at Harwell, west of Didcot and at Wantage.”

Whilst 3.5 only presents a vision, this sentence about road improvements is too restrictive.

“The strategic road improvements defined in the SVUK Transport Package will have been implemented, for example at Harwell, west of Didcot and at Wantage.”

Or wording to match the “vision” for SE Vale set out in 5.49.

30	Q8	Strategic objectives
----	----	----------------------

Strategic objectives focus on benefits for existing residents. Growth will depend on the net immigration of people currently living outside the Vale. There should be a specific objective to state and clarify this.

If there is any implied priority, then Objective 5 should move to be after Objectives 6 and 7.

Objective 9. Remove the words ‘wherever possible’.

Objective 12 to minimise greenhouse gas emissions should have a target, e.g. to be the lowest in the county, instead of the current highest in the county, or better still a target set in absolute terms e.g. emissions/head.

All the Key Outcomes are not expressed as Outcomes, but as targets or goals. Either change the heading, or re-write the outcomes to describe what the outcome will be, rather than aspirations of what it might be.

30	Q9	Strategic objectives aim to promote opportunities for all in district
----	----	---

See Q8 about implied provision of opportunities for people not currently in the district.

33	3.6 on	Building healthy and sustainable communities
----	--------	--

Key Outcome 1. This number of 13,294 is impossibly precise. The phrase about meeting local needs is incorrect and misleading because the number includes houses for net immigration.

Outcome 9 should clarify whether this is affordable homes as in social housing, or whether it means market affordable. Parish Council supports outcomes which provide houses at a price that can be afforded by all, especially younger people, so that they do not need to move out of the area, and older people so that they can downsize.

Outcome 10 should recognise that many older people wish do not need specialist accommodation as such, but accommodation of a size, price and

location appropriate to their needs.

34 Supporting economic prosperity

Whereas the key outcomes for housing presented a target of a number of houses, there are no quantifiable outcomes listed. It should be more specific about the outcomes in terms of the actual numbers of jobs desired.

This lack of specific targets is also a problem with the sub-area strategies.

Some understanding of the number of jobs to be created is needed to as to understand the housing numbers, and how many are needed to support people moving into the Vale to take up new jobs.

35 Sustainable transport and accessibility

Key outcomes should include a statement about the A417

Key outcome #9 refers to home working. It should be noted that Topic Paper 6, page 12, fig 2 does not agree with census table Q5701EW, which says that within the Vale 5% work at home, not 12.8%.

36 Protecting the environment and responding to climate change

Key outcomes must include one that reflects Objective 12 to minimise greenhouse gas emissions.

Eg greenhouse gas emissions will be the lowest in the county, instead of the current highest in the county, or better still a target set in absolute terms e.g. emissions/head.

38 Q10 Spatial strategy for development

Badly phrased question. Presume it means para 4.8- 4.13 as well as core policy 2.

The Parish Council cannot support the location of developments in its Parish unless and until there is robust evidence supporting the housing numbers, and clear commitments to the provision of the transport infrastructure that will preserve the identity of the existing settlement in the Parish – ie Harwell Village.

38 Q11 Housing provision

The SE Plan target of 578 houses per annum was unfounded, unrealistic and unachievable. We now have to wait for the targets to emerge from the SHMAA. Comment in the meantime is a bit of a waste of time.

However, whilst the Parish Council understands that the Government imposes a methodology to be followed for an SHMAA, the Parish Council would like to see the overall housing targets expressed in summary terms to explain:

- Houses required to meet population growth within the district
- Houses required to reflect a revised population mix, e.g. divorce couple needing two homes, young people leaving a family home etc.
- Houses required for net immigration into the district. This figure can then be related to the employment figures.

38 Q12 Strategic Housing allocation

See Q10. The Parish Council does not accept the target of 5150 additional homes and hence the question about where else they should be located is not relevant. The real question is why these houses are needed at all. We await the SHMAA.

39 Q13 Employment Land

The Spatial Strategy (box on page 38) says it makes provision for 14,300 jobs in 143 ha of employment land. This target of 14,300 jobs is repeated only once in para 4.24. Nowhere is there any substance behind this number, nor any division of this number into the different nominated employment sites.

Topic Paper 6, Table 4, page 34 uses a figure of 6000 jobs at Harwell Oxford campus. Given its context of traffic modelling, this must a total jobs figure which seems very low, and highlights the need for clear statements about current and existing job numbers.

Understanding where these jobs will be based is essential to understanding the infrastructure provision.

See comments on para 5.45 and table 5.4

The Parish Council accepts that Harwell Campus, given its history, and its focus as a site for scientific excellent is an appropriate place for employment. More attention is needed to make sure that this employment is appropriate to the location within an AONB. Additional traffic, apart from commuter traffic, should not be allowed. i.e. it should be clear that the site is not appropriate for warehousing or distribution centres which would generate a large amount to heavy goods traffic.

39 Q14 Infrastructure delivery, and specifically a) CP5 and b) the Infrastructure Delivery Plan

See CP5 for specific response.

The Infrastructure Delivery Plan

The Parish Council has many issues and concerns with the plan, but notes that the “approach to infrastructure delivery and funding is still in development”.

The Parish Council would like to be fully involved whilst the infrastructure plans are developed.

The objectives of the Parish Council are:

- To ensure that Harwell Village is not used by any of the through traffic resulting from the expansion of Didcot
- To ensure that the A417 Reading Road through the village is properly engineered to accept any traffic increase safely

To achieve this it thinks that:

- The Harwell Link Road is essential
- The Harwell Field Road is probably essential.

The Parish Council also notes that the IDP, and specifically the COTM data and stress tests do not provide enough evidence one way or another to demonstrate that the proposals will work.

The Parish Council is especially concerned about plans to route significant amounts of traffic onto the A34. Whilst this might be adequate when traffic is running smoothly, incidents on the A34 tend to have exaggerated effect. The evidence base should include a recent history of incidents on the relevant stretches of the A34 – their frequency, their duration and an estimate of the severity of their impact.

The Parish Council has additional concerns about the capacity of the Didcot link road to carry the lorries and traffic from an expanded Didcot to and from the Milton Interchange.

Both this road and the A34 already have a poor reputation, and there is a concern that traffic will never be persuaded to use these routes and will head south and west through East Hagbourne and Harwell en-route to the campus and the A34.

It is these concerns that lead the Parish Council to suggest that removal of the Harwell Field Road from the plans may have an extreme impact on the village and the A417.

The request to retain the Harwell Field Road was supported at a consultation meeting run by the Parish Council, attended by about 70 parishioners.

This same meeting raised the option of adding slip roads onto the A34 northbound at the A417 (by the Kingswell Hotel). Another suggestion was slip roads north of the B4493 Didcot-Harwell Rd.

The Parish Council supports the investigation of these options and requests that they are given full consideration in the next states of the IDP.

A final concern with the IDP, and the evidence base, relates to the housing NE of Didcot.

- Have contributions from this development been taken into account in apportioning infrastructure costs to the strategic sites in the viability assessment?
 - Does the traffic modelling include enough allowance for traffic generated by the NE Didcot housing and all other Didcot developments, including GWP?
-

43 CP1 Sustainable development

For a layman, this policy is too wide open to interpretation, and depends on a definition of “material considerations”.

Request clarification and rewording

45 CP2 Settlement Hierarchy

“Larger villages are defined as settlements with a more limited range of employment, services and facilities, where development will be limited to providing for local needs and to support employment, services and facilities within local communities.”

To avoid confusion, suggest a clarification that villages are the settlement, and not parishes.

The Parish Council welcomes the limitation to *providing for local needs*. This needs repeating in CP3

48 CP3 Housing Delivery

The policy is positive about where development is permitted, but silent about where it is not. Would like it strengthened to say:

Development outside of the existing built area of these settlements will be **not be permitted unless**

This policy should also repeat (and hence reinforce) the stricture in CP2 that development in larger villages will be limited to local needs

49 Table 4.1

Includes a commitment of 600 houses, which presumably is GWP.

This number is more likely to be 750, and possibly an additional 65 houses for Grove Road in Harwell. Hence the number should be correctly stated at the next version of the plan, **AND** all targets for Valley Park, which currently read 2150 be correspondingly reduced to 2000, or even 1935 houses.

This should be factored into the housing numbers after completion of the SHMAA.

49 Table 4.1

Table says that there are 1055 houses whose site has yet to be identified.

The Parish Council requests a policy similar to the principles in the defunct

IHSP that permission will not be granted for developments in large villages which include strategic sites in their immediate vicinity.

51 4.31

This 6.5 hectares is included within the 28 hectares to be provided at Milton Park within Harwell Parish

Don't think this is within Harwell Parish

54 CP5 Providing Supporting Infrastructure and Services

The Parish Council is not expert in this area, but would like to be assured that Core Policy 5 provides the Council with the best possible protection to ensure that

A) Speculative planning applications which in themselves might have little impact on the infrastructure cannot be permitted unless appropriate contributions are made. And

B) The development of larger projects is done in a way that funding for infrastructure is provided before it is needed, rather than afterwards.

The Parish Council is also concerned about the rumours of the impact of the recent Growth and Infrastructure Bill which might further erode the protections implied within this policy.

Recognition might also be needed about the special status of development zones

Phrase like "in the last resort" and "If a ... levy" give the impression that this may not be a very watertight policy with too much room for developers to avoid their obligations to the community.

55 Q15 Approach to sub-areas

Whilst the Parish Council has no specific objection to the division into sub-areas, the consequence is that there is a lot of repetition between Chapters 4 and 5.

It is also difficult to distinguish between policies and strategies. Chapter 4, Spatial Strategies has three Core Policies, and there are twelve for the sub-areas. These are then followed by District wide policies (Chapter 6). This leads to a lot of confusing overlap between, for example,
CP5 Providing Supporting Infrastructure and Services
CP14 Transport Delivery for the South-East Vale Sub-Area
CP29 Promoting Sustainable Transport and Accessibility

This overlap is repeated in the text, eg

4.32 – 4.38 Providing supporting infrastructure and services (Spatial)

5.66 – 5.78 Transport (SEVale)

6.81 – 6.88 The local and strategic transport network (District)

It would make more sense to consider District policies before sub-area policies.

A further example of confusion and duplication relates to Neighbourhood planning. The bullet point on page 58 under the SEV subarea could be stated as district wide. The other two sub-areas do have remarks specific to their area, but also repeat the generic statement.

Similar examples apply to all the major themes in the Plan.

Nearly all housing and employment is provided in the South East Area. The Parish Council does not agree with the levels of housing and employment development proposed. Details are argued in appropriate locations elsewhere

70	5.38 on	South East Vale Sub-Area Strategy
----	---------	-----------------------------------

A paragraph is needed to highlight that the sub-area is adjacent to Didcot and the problem that housing, employment and transport issues in the sub-area cannot be addressed without taking Didcot into account

74/75	Figure 5.4	SE Vale Sub Area
-------	------------	------------------

Caption needed for location #4

75/76	CP12	Spatial Strategy for SEV
-------	------	--------------------------

“Over the plan period (2006 to 2029), at least 9535 new homes will be provided ...”

Please change **at least** to **up to**
Similar wording change is needed for each sub-area

Figures for number of jobs are needed for the employment provision

76/77	Table 5.3	SEV Housing Targets
-------	-----------	---------------------

Same comments as page 49 Table 4.1

Table includes a commitment of 600 houses, which presumably is GWP.

This number is more likely to be 750, and possibly an additional 65 houses for Grove Road in Harwell. Hence the number should be correctly stated at the next version of the plan, AND all targets for Valley Park, which currently read 2150 be correspondingly reduced to 2000, or even 1935 houses.

76/77	Table 5.4	Proposed employment provision in the South East Vale Sub-Area
-------	-----------	---

Expressing the proposed employment provision in the South East Vale Sub-

Area in terms of hectares is not very helpful. Forecasts of numbers of jobs to be provided are also needed, together with some kind of evidence to support those forecasts. Without job numbers for each location how can the infrastructure provisions be planned?

80/81 5.68

“Working jointly with key partners including Oxfordshire County Council, South Oxfordshire District Council and the Highways Agency, the recommendations of these studies have been refined into a package of transport measures known as the 'Science Vale UK Integrated Transport Package'. The package is required to enable all the growth within this sub area as well as the growth at Didcot and Culham Science Centre within South Oxfordshire.”

See comment on 5.69 below – this statement is also misleading, at the least. Whilst the Parish Council welcomes the recognition that the package is required, it’s not very convincing because the package is still work in progress and work on it at the moment is not complete, and the evidence base does not yet support the proposals.

80/81 5.69

“The Science Vale UK Integrated Transport Package is outlined in detail in the Infrastructure Delivery Plans that accompany this plan. This package also forms part of the Science Vale UK Area Strategy within Oxfordshire’s Local Transport Plan.”

This paragraph is devious and untruthful. The package outlined in the IDP reflects work in progress which has not be approved yet at any level within OCC, and cannot be said to be part of the OCC LTP right now. Maybe in the future it will be, but until that happens this paragraph is wrong.

81/82 Fig 5.6b

Map showing the proposed SVUK strategic cycle network

Much more detail needed. There are no specifics of the proposals, and red arrows saying “movements to and from the north” add no value to anything.

83/84 CP14

Transport Delivery for the South-East Vale Sub-Area

“In order to deliver the growth in this sub area and the wider Science Vale UK area, the Science Vale UK Integrated Transport Package has been identified as necessary to mitigate the impact of the planned growth across Science Vale UK and secure the future economic viability of the area.”

Don’t understand the word mitigate in this context. Suggest rewrite to say: In order to deliver the growth in this sub area and the wider Science Vale UK area, the Science Vale UK Integrated Transport Package **is essential to enable** the planned growth across Science Vale UK and secure the future economic viability of the area.

Policy should also say that planning applications for housing will not be considered unless there is funding and a clear implementation plan for the transport delivery.

There is a possible key weakness in the current evidence base presented in Topic Paper 6 and other documents, in that the total figures for housing growth in Didcot do not seem to be included in the modelling. In the context of stress testing, table 3 and 5 housing numbers states a number of 5400 new houses in the model. A better number would be 9000, and whatever number is used it must take into account new housing in NE Didcot, and ensure that all housing (built and un-built) for GWP is included.

84/85 CP15 Safeguarding of land for transport schemes in the South East Vale Sub- Area

Where safeguarded land occurs on strategic housing sites (eg Harwell Link Rd is laid on top of Valley Park) some words are need to ensure that the housing development doesn't start with a planning blight imposed by this policy.

On the other hand, the Parish Council would be delighted to see the policy of no houses on safeguarded land applied to the land reserved for the Harwell Link Rd. – it might contribute towards some form of rural gap.

94 Q16 Do you have any comments on each of the district wide policies 18-40?

Yes. Comments presented against appropriate policy

97/98 CP18 Affordable Housing

The 40% target should be justified by the emerging SHMAA, as also should the split between social and intermediate housing.

Hopefully the SHMAA will also address the actual demand for social housing within the Vale. It is alleged that the social housing waiting list for the Vale is less than 2000 units. 40% of the planned units will generate far more than this, and so a clear justification for the need should be made.

The application of this policy to sites with a net gain of three dwellings may turn out to be too severe, and encourage the building of say 3 x 4 bed houses on a plot where the real local demand is for more, smaller and cheaper/affordable units. Depending on the SHMAA, please consider a higher threshold.

The Parish Council supports the comments from CPRE to strengthen the sentence “Off-site contribution and/or financial contributions for the provision of affordable housing in lieu of on-site provision may be appropriate if it can be robustly justified that:” to say

Off-site contribution and/or financial contributions for the provision of affordable housing in lieu of on-site provision will not be approved unless:

98/99 CP19 Rural Exception Sites

The Parish Council supports the comments from CPRE and suggests adding

vi. The development has the support of the local community as represented by the local parish council

100/101 CP20 Density

On all new housing developments a minimum density of 30 dwellings per hectare (net) will be required

There is probably a planning standard for calculating housing density, but for the avoidance of doubt it should be made clear whether land for open spaces, or community buildings is taken into account when calculating this figure. The word (net) possibly means this, but it should be explained. It should also be clarified whether this is an overall target for a development or whether it must be applied to each and every hectare. Circumstances under which exceptions to this policy are allowed should also be defined, possibly for smaller developments in specific contexts.

101/102 CP21 Housing Mix

It seems to be a major oversight and a weakness in the plan that the housing mix is not defined. A figure based on SE Plan numbers would help allow the evaluation of the Vale's approach to meeting its other policy targets. It is noted that assumptions are made about the housing mix in the Viability Studies for the Strategic Sites, and it is a shame that those numbers could not have been included in the Plan.

This will be a key policy for when then SHMAA is complete.

The Parish Council believes that this policy must take account of needs of first time buyers, and the older population – see CP23

The policy must also indicate the powers that a local community has to recommend and impose alterations to the policy for specific local developments.

104/105 CP23 Ageing Population

“ii. residential dwelling houses designed for older people (with or without care) should be provided in the strategic site allocations in Local Plan 2029 Part 1 and other suitable locations in accordance with the spatial strategy”

This appears to be an aspiration with no clarity about how the Policy will be implemented. Specific targets should be included with each allocated strategic site.

Hence we agree with the statement in Topic Paper 4, 5.43 that a target should

be set within the Plan.

Appendix A

138/139

Harwell Oxford Campus

Somewhere, either in the Plan or in Topic Paper 3, mention should be made of the old prefabricated housing on the Harwell Campus site, with an explanation of why that area (presumably) is not suitable for housing now.

139/140

Access and Highways

Consider the possibility of better integration with North Drive

Add a bullet on the lines of:

- Work with the residents of the North Drive houses to achieve best possible integration of the new houses and roads with the existing layout.

139/140

Social and Community

No mention of contributions to adjoining settlement to provide facilities which cannot realistically be provided in this settlement

Add a bullet

- Contributions towards amenities in the neighbouring settlement of Harwell Village that will be needed by the residents.

150/151

Valley Park

Fundamentally the Parish Council is opposed to Valley Park because:

- It is not convinced of the need for the houses
- It objects to the westward spread of Didcot and the loss of rural amenities
- It fears the eventual spread of Didcot to encompass Harwell village
- It is not convinced that the infrastructure plans will be sufficient to keep traffic out of the village

The target numbers reflect a historic, and arbitrary, split of SE Plan and Growth Point Houses between the Vale and SODC, and do not take into account any over delivery of Vale Housing in GWP. The final housing numbers remain to be justified in the SHMAA, but meanwhile the Parish Council believes that a target of 1700 houses is more appropriate.

Topic Paper 3, Table 3.1 page 10 recalls the 2009 plans which divided Valley Park into preferred and alternative options. TP3 4.13 says that the site south of the Wantage Road is now identified as a preferred option but is to be treated as a contingency.

This approach is not adopted as policy in the Plan, and nor is it in the Appendix and it must be, lest this distinction is overlooked. In fact the distinction is already lost in TP3 5.2, although TP3 5.3 implies that even the selection of strategic sites is a work in progress.

The Parish Council requests that the land south of the Wantage Rd is excised from the strategic sites areas. If that doesn't happen it requests that the Plan makes it clear that the land south of the Wantage Rd is contingency land only and should not be used for housing at all. Preferable this land should be part of the designated areas of open space which are required for Valley Park.

If there are any developments considered for this land, and also on the adjoining land north of the Wantage Road it is essential that a Rural Gap is maintain consistent with retained policies NE10 and H7 and the Landscape Consideration statement page 152 requiring "Careful treatment of boundary between the development areas and Harwell village so as to protect its separate identity". A rewording of this statement is required to ensure that there is a specific commitment to maintain a rural gap on the east side of the A34 along the Wantage Road.

Given that so much of the plan is work in progress the Parish Council requests discussion about the optimal route for the Link Route.

- North of the sewage farm, should it be a perimeter road or a spine road going through the estate.
- South of the sewage farm, should it head straight for, and run parallel to the A34, or should move further east, and help support the rural gap between Harwell and Didcot by providing a landscaped "island" between the A3 and the link road.

150/151

Map

Modify the map to reflect the overall Valley Park comments, removing land south of the Wantage Rd and the land immediately north of the Wantage Road, or marking them each as contingency land, not to be used for building.

150/151

Key objectives

Add a new bullet

- To maintain a rural gap between the A34 east of Harwell and the boundary of Great Western Park

"To deliver up to 2150 homes" Change to

- To deliver up to 1700 homes

"To provide land and contributions towards a learning park and special needs school" Omit learning park, so it reads

- To provide land and contributions towards a special needs school
-

150/151 Access and Highways

“A network of footpaths and cycle ways giving access from the new homes to the internal green spaces and the countryside and from the site to the adjoining network.”

This is a meaningless and objectionable sentence because the housing replaces the existing countryside. Only retain the bullet if it can be more specific about where the countryside is that the network will give access to.

New bullet, to ensure retention of Cow Lane

- Harwell Village (Footpath and Cycleway via Cow Lane)

151/152 Social and Community

“Land for, and contributions towards, a learning park “

Delete “Land for” , so it reads just:

- Contributions towards, a learning park

Add a new bullet

- Land for allotments and a burial ground

151/152 Landscape Considerations

“Careful treatment of boundary between the development areas and Harwell Village so as to protect its separate identity.”

Change to

- Protect the separate identity of Harwell Village by limiting the southern edge of Valley Park to at least 600m to the north of the B4493.

“No development in flood zone 2 in the north of the site, other than flood resilient physical infrastructure.”

Technically the flood zone is not in Valley Park, hence change to

- No development in flood zone 2 to the north of the site, other than flood resilient physical infrastructure.

151/152 Ecology

“Provide contributions towards redressing the identified Green Infrastructure deficit in the area surrounding Didcot.”

Please explain what this means.

Parish Council argues that the building of Valley Park also causes a Green Infrastructure deficit in Harwell Parish, so would also welcome contributions.

151/152 New heading

The Parish Council supports the Keep Harwell Rural proposal of a new heading

Conserving the natural environment

- Take into account the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land by using areas of poorer quality land in preference to that of a higher quality

183/184

Appendix F List of Saved Policies

Parish Council welcomes the retention of policies

- NE10 Urban fringes and countryside gaps
- H7 Major development west of Didcot

And suggests that they need review and incorporation into the Plan to reflect the current realities on the ground, especially with respect to GWP and Valley Park.

It would be helpful if these retained policies could be listed in full in the next version of the Plan, so there is no need to go back to the previous plan for details.
