

No.	Question	Response
1	What will happen to the land north of the relief road in PYR2?	2.2ha will be transferred to OCC for use by ICC in school time and community use outside of school requirements. The rest will be transferred to Pyrton Parish Council. Should the school relocate, the 2.2ha will be transferred to Pyrton Parish Council on the understanding that community sports use will still be provided.
2	How much area is required for housing? 4ha or 5ha?	OCC have discussed this with Providence Homes and the total area is 5ha. With 4ha. allocated for housing, and 1ha. for environmental mitigation. The alignment shown is the optimum arrangement for all stakeholders but a minor rebalance may be achievable subject to discussions as preliminary design progresses.
3	In the north is it possible to realign the relief road so that it passes south of PYR1 rather than as shown?	OCC have discussed this possibility with Beechcroft Developments Ltd and unfortunately there are a range of problems that make this option undeliverable.
4	What mitigation is proposed for noise/visual/air impact along the route?	Landscaping and mitigation requirements will be assessed and decided in the following stages of the project.
5	What are the street lighting proposals along the route?	Street Lighting requirements will be assessed in the following stages of the project. Given the speed limit will be 30mph, there is a requirement for street lighting although appropriate lighting levels will be assessed.
6	Will Pyrton Lane be closed to traffic?	It makes sense to close the existing Pyrton Lane and make this a walking/cycling link
7	Can the speed limit of station road be changed to 30mph?	This can be investigated further in the next stages of the project
8	Can the Britwell Road end of the relief road be been swept around and the priority changed so that it is a more desirable route? This may require third party land to work	This is being investigated further, similar to the original Bloor proposal.
9	What is the OCC assessment of how effective the route will be in attracting through traffic away from the town centre?	We may need to consider elements of traffic calming to remove traffic from Watlington, whether this is required or not is part of forthcoming traffic modelling. We understand you have had discussions with other OCC officers about a 20mph zone through the town.
10	Can OCC provide some clarity on the proposed bus dropping off point for ICC?	Liason with the school is ongoing as to how they can make best use of this facility
11	How will the edge road contribute to improvements in provision for active travel?	This will be investigated further in the preliminary design stage, the provision of a shared use path along the full length of the relief road is planned, with the south side being the preference.
12	How will bus services be provided along the edge road?	This is being considered internally at the moment.
13	Crossing points will be needed at junctions with the B4009 at both ends of the edge road and with Cuxham Road. These are needed to for walkers, cyclists and horse riders to connect with the rights of way network in a safe way.	This will be investigated further in the preliminary design stage.
14	Will the developer provide planting and an acoustic barrier around both the school playing fields and new houses on WAT C?	Landscaping and noise mitigation requirements will be assessed and decided in the following stages of the project although purely from houses there is unlikely to be a significant increase in noise to trigger the need for acoustic dampening.
15	The road through Site C has been scalloped closer to the Manor and grounds. You explained this is necessary for the contours to match with the road across PYR2. Can OCC, or SODC can compel the developers of Site C to do a extensive planting along the border with the Manor grounds. This to create a decent and dense woodland area acting as a green buffer between the road, new houses, and the manor grounds.	Noted - The comments will be passed to SODC who will determine the planning application for WAT C
16	What is the proposed speed limit for the relief road?	30 mph.
17	Will there be a HGV ban on the relief road?	Any roads that are subject to the area-wide weight limit will remain the same as after this road is constructed so any vehicles using this road will have to be for access purposes only.
18	It appears the study did not take into consideration the shortfalls of sports provision in the area. The adopted South Oxfordshire District Council's Playing Pitch Strategy identified the need for additional playing field/pitches. The current site cannot accommodate the increasing demand.	The study undertaken by OCC is related to the provision of a relief road to Watlington, and whilst we have looked to incorporate space for school playfields we have done so because this is a requirement of the planning applications submitted by Providence Homes. The amount of housing in PYR2 to trigger the need for provisions of this nature has not been reached therefore it is not a requirement of the road or the housing. North of the link road 2ha. of additional recreational space is proposed as part of the wider project. This will be primarily for school use but can also be made available for community use outside of school requirements which will satisfy the demand for extra pitches. As well as this the current footprint of the existing sports pitches will be increased.
19	The proposed road creates planning blight in the ability to create a double cricket pitch site which is need.	The space has been designed to be multi use and in line with key stakeholders wishes for the area. A dual-pitch cricket facility is unrealistic and not supported by other stakeholders and is not an objective of this project.

20	It would be relevantly easy at this stage to realign the proposed road so that it does not impact on the potential for creating a double cricket pitch site.	The plans sent to OCC by independent consultancies do not accurately reflect the red line boundary of the Providence site, the relief road needs to be outside of this. The plan produceds have significantly reduced the footprint from the Providence Masterplan below the 5ha. footprint required (4ha. for housing and 1ha. for environmental mitigation). One cricket pitch can be adequately sited on the site. If Icknield Community College relocates in the future, then WCC can discuss this becoming a new pitch with Pyrton Parish Council when the land is transferred to them as part of the agreement. The alignmet shown has the support of key stakeholders and is a fair balance.
21	Sports England would welcome the opportunity to have a further meeting to disucss the proposals in more detail	A meeting was held with Sports England on 07/04/21 to discuss the responses given and involved representatives from OCC & SODC. Sports England accepted OCC & SODC's approach to the design and the decision making process. Sports England now understand that there is no requirement as part of the PYR2 development to provide for sports provision.
22	The exercise for the road alignment that has been undertaken does not take into account much if any of the information that contained in the document The Future Development of PYR2 - a balanced approach	OCC have engaged with stakeholders throughout the optioneering. In this process it was clear that although the options produced in the document mentioned were well thought out, they did not adequately satisfy all stakeholders and did not sufficiently consider the possibility of the school not relocating. It was felt by most stakeholders that a double cricket pitch facility was unrealistic and that a multi-use sports facility would better suit the community. The alignment has deviated from the safeguarded route following discussions with stakeholders to a point where both Parish Councils are happy with the proposal in principle.
23	There is no summary of the needs of the stakeholders in the area even though these have been put forward alongside our needs (Cricket Club)	This has been provided within this response
24	There is also no summary to show how OCC have considered that they have met the needs of the stakeholders in bringing forward the alignment that they have	This has been provided within this response
25	The only matter that appears to have had some consideration is the need or some of the needs of the school (probably under pressure from other departments on OCC) including a drop off for the school, a massive road configuration that will no doubt have to be dug up once the school moves to Chalgrove. Surely alternative provisions could be made to obviate the needs for such expenditure in the short term until the future of the school can be timetabled. Also, with the road alignment at the corner of the school grounds a drop off there perhaps in the edge of the school grounds would be more considerate and practical, especially given that a substantial are of new playing field is being negotiated without thought of others.	In moving the road further away from Pyrton Lane into the current school playing fields we have opened up a green gap between Watlington and Pyrton, something which both parishes are happy with. In order to do this, the school required mitigation. There is also an agreement in one of the planning decisions for Providence to supply land to ICC for additional school playfields. Road alignment requirements mean that the radii cannot be tightened down any more than shown so the facility is a good use of space that can become parking provision in the future for the school playing fields when this area transfers to Pyrton and becomes sports provision. This demonstrates the needs of Pyrton Manor, ICC and both parishes have been considered in the revised alignment.
26	The alignment shown does not work for cricket as currently shown because even if the dimensions of the cricket ground were reduced further from the minimum that we have shown, it is important to recognise that the ball will travel the same distance and therefore the juxtaposition to the road is important from a safety point of view.	One Cricket pitch will adequately fit on the site.
27	Watlington Cricket Club has a shared ground with football, but as both the sports are growing on the site, there is increasing inter-sport conflict. There is a need to find additional playing field space, which could be either for football or cricket. There will be a need to identify and secure an appropriate site and funding for the facility, so this is likely to be medium-long term aspiration.	It is good that both sports are growing in the area and we are aware that Watlington PC are exploring new sites for the Cricket Club.

28	The 2035 Local Plan specifically seeks to provide new recreational facilities in Policies CF4 and in CF5 indicates clearly that (2) New residential development will be required to provide or contribute towards accessible sport and recreation facilities, including playing pitches, having regard to the Council's most up to date Leisure Study, and Sport England guidance. (3) The provision of open space, sport, recreation and play facilities, and playing pitches is expected to be delivered on site, unless this is demonstrated not to be feasible. (4). Provision for the future long-term maintenance and management of the open space and facilities will be sought and must be agreed as part of the planning application. There is, therefore, the need to take consideration of the need for provision of recreation facilities. Therefore, the District Council will be seeking to ensure the identified needs for cricket and football are catered for on PYR2. Accordingly, the land allocated must be fit for purpose in order that the sports identified, in this case cricket can be provided. The road alignment in its current form does not allow for the provision to be provided on this site but could be altered to ensure the relevant space is provided.	The school playing field site will be made available for community use outside of school times. Long term this will remain the case as Pyrton Parish Council is supportive of sports provision on the site.
29	A new consideration is that Pyrton PC have issued a statement with respect to the future use of the 6 hectares of land that is proposed to be given to them as part of the planning application land carve up. They have indicated that there is no place for recreation in their plans preferring to turn the area into a wild landscape ie do nothing as a preference which is understandable.	The land to be transferred to Pyrton PC is theirs to do with as they wish. The land to be transferred to OCC will be used for sports provision by ICC and the community. Long term if this transfers to Pyrton PC they have agreed to retain its use for sports provision.
30	We will still be making our case that recreation needs to be provided for in the planning application as it states in the policy approach and it therefore needs to be paced within the relief road. It would seem that the calculations do work if the following is considered. The housing land required is 4h. the school require 2h, and Cricket requires 4h. The site is 14h so there would be 4h for Pyrton. An even carve up and the land for Pyrton would be more than sufficient to carry out its objectives.	There is no requirement to provide sports provision.
31	We attach our proposal that still maintains the balanced approach that we have always advocated. We have though given more land to Pyrton in our option as we are happy to put forward a ground sharing option with the school in that they get the land to use until they move and after that the land is transferred to WPC and /or WPC to fulfil the obligations with regard to recreation Land. Pyrton will therefore still have the lions share. Further the location of the school land/Cricket field will provide a deep buffer for the Manor House and add to the separation of Pyrton from Watlington, engrained in the Pyrton NP which we have always respected.	The plan shown moves the road closer to Pyrton Manor which was one of the main reasons for locating it further south and also moves the drop off area further away from the school entrance which will not be supported by the school. The area for housing is not known but the assumption is this is 4ha. Providence require 5ha. total area to deliver the 4ha. of housing as 1ha. is required for environmental mitigation to deliver the site. A deviation from this will make the scheme undeliverable as it will not be taken forward by the land agent. The plan is based around a northern alignment similar to that shown in the safeguarded route which is not supported by Pyrton PC.
32	One of the issues within the report was the cost and alignment of the road that is a balancing act. We have shown a simpler line that is shorter and will therefore cost less We still query the need for the turning head for the coaches given the short term needs of the school on this site but have shown it anyway for the short term. This land could be a carpark allowing access to both the cricket ground and the PPC rewilding land.	The Turning head is a mitigation measure and aids removing traffic from Watlington itself which is a key aim of the project.
33	The road proposals provided give no information on size, lighting, traffic speed, traffic calming measures, pedestrian/cycle routes, crossings, bus stops or any other information to be able to make judgement.	At this moment in time we do not have sufficient detail of all elements but this will develop as the scheme progresses, and you will be consulted further at the relevant stages. Speed limit will be 30mph, a shared use path will be adjacent to the relief road and traffic calming measures are not proposed
34	The increase in traffic with thousands of new developments proposed throughout the length of the indicated routes shown in the adopted local plan will be a significant increase, many times over and above that currently experienced on the B4009.	Noted
35	We have an entitlement to the enjoyment of the clean air, a quiet environment and the absence of light pollution that we have experienced over the last 15 years, and believe that any and all proposed changes would significantly depreciate that level of entitlement.	Mitigation requirements will be assessed and decided in the following stages of the project.
36	We are seeking further advice on this current situation and the manner in which it has been communicated to us.	Please do seek further advice. At this moment in time we do not have sufficient detail of all elements but this will develop as the scheme progresses, and you will be consulted further at the relevant stages.

37	<p>The South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2035 allocates proportionate growth at Watlington of 15% supported by existing infrastructure, which is not 400 dwellings.</p> <p>There has never been an explanation how the fund over wrote the statutory functions, duties and rights of allocation of housing sites through the local planning authority's plan making powers - and continues to do so.</p>	<p>This question has been forwarded to SODC for an answer as it is not specific to the OAR</p>
38	<p>Oxfordshire County Council says the sum of £7,400 per dwelling contribution can be asked for from developers but with 400 houses this leaves a huge shortfall for a project said to be “part funded by the development” of houses.</p>	<p>The scheme is funded from growth deal funding</p>
39	<p>AECOM's report misses the fact that local "planned" housing growth has already been granted based on using spare highway capacity and improving it by local interventions - including parking removal. AECOM, and the fund, has to argue for speculative housing (presented in the report as planned on the strength of a speculative planning application for 100 dwellings in Pyrton) to justify a relief road. The benefits of not needing a relief road by not allowing 100 additional speculative houses has not been considered.</p>	
40	<p>The climate emergency seems to be largely ignored, which is extraordinary. There is no reason given why a transport scheme has not had to put great weight on if it mitigates and adapts to climate change and contributes to net zero. The report sets out that Watlington is a relatively unsustainable, high carbon emitting, car dependent, rural location (hence its growth is limited in the LP). The solution to this is, amazingly, to build a relief road with high embodied carbon (since the preferred route is partly through flood zone), and high operational carbon given a relief road will do nothing to change that individual vehicle use will remain the only realistic choice, and will increase from additional dwellings.</p>	
41	<p>The report recognises the importance of Watlington being three miles off a motorway junction. Any gains from the claimed increases in active travel (which seem most unlikely in practice), will be vastly outweighed by the reassignment of through traffic diverting off M40 Junction 6 to make use of a new road, as demonstrated by Atkins strategic traffic model.</p>	
42	<p>Report structure - has the latest version of the DfT's Transport Appraisal Guidance (TAG) been used for analysis (update due February 2021?)?</p>	

43	<p>"Planned" housing at Watlington - as set out in policies in the adopted South Oxfordshire LP 2035 - is proportionate 15% growth supported by existing infrastructure as a larger village in the settlement hierarchy (LP 2035 para 4.18, Policy H4).</p> <p>Providence Land in its consultation responses to the LP asked the planning authority to accelerate housing growth at Watlington by adding 100 dwellings to H4, but the LPA refused and kept housing growth at Watlington as proportionate. It must have had material reasons for doing this.</p> <p>AECOM refers throughout the report to "planned development sites" (2.4.48 Other planned development sites, mentioned in both the Watlington Neighbourhood Development Plan and the Pyrton Neighbourhood Plan and the report goes on to list Pyr 1 and Pyr 2).</p> <p>AECOM refers to the benefits of facilitating housing in Pyrton but when it refers to "planned" housing in Pyrton, it is referring to housing that is speculative and largely not supported by policies in the development plan. This undermines an ambitious local plan process, that already allocates a scale of development well in excess of land required to meet housing need. If not corrected, it allows any speculative housing proposal, that has not been through the process of public consultation, as part of developing a local plan; that has not been allocated by the LPA and that does not meet many of the development plan's policies, to be described as if it does.</p> <p>The three planned, allocated housing sites in Watlington referred to in 2.4.60 (1) all have planning permission. Policies in Watlington Neighbourhood Development Plan do not allow a relief road, or any of the other transport options, to add a single extra dwelling at Watlington. Considering the Pyrton NDP, the Watlington NDP and local responses to planning applications, there is not support for a relief road to facilitate housing growth around Watlington, over and above proportionate growth.</p>	This question has been forwarded to SODC for an answer as it is not specific to the OAR
44	<p>2.4.60 (2). Manage traffic growth across an expanded Watlington</p> <p>AECOM says current traffic levels are causing problems. Neither the planning authority or the highway authority objected that 15% housing growth could be supported by the existing highway infrastructure with local enhancements funded by site developers. There must currently be spare existing capacity.</p>	
	<p>There is a useful body of evidence from various traffic studies of Watlington that identify very significant opportunities to increase capacity of existing highway, which have not been considered by AECOM. These studies need to be considered and an explanation given.</p>	

	<p>It is very surprising that the report covers air quality and quotes an AECOM study (Watlington Parking Study) that was not commissioned as an air quality report. The considerable body of expert evidence from leading low emission strategy consultants Ricardo on Watlington and air quality has not been considered. AECOM speculates without evidence about long term air quality benefits of a relief road. This has been examined in detail by Ricardo with the conclusion "future compliance with the Air Quality Objective is not reliant on the presence of the relief road (edge road)".</p> <p>https://oxfordshire.air-quality.info/documents/ED13626_SODC_Watlington_Issue_1_Addendum.pdf</p> <p>Historical air quality data for Watlington should be included in the report so there is an understanding that NO2 levels have very significantly reduced compared to the mid 2010s to either no exceedances, or fractional in one location, in recent years.</p> <p>AECOM has an understanding of stop start driving since it refers to this in its report concerning route option A2&4 -B4. There is nothing to suggest it has fairly considered that existing highway capacity can be increased from managing stop start driving on Shirburn Street and Couching Street by removal of on street parking.</p>	
45	<p>The decision to grant P17/S3231/O APP/Q3115/W/19/3222822 identified the extraordinary positive effect on traffic flow on Shirburn St and Couching St of straight forward, inexpensive changes to the current man made clogged up layout. Limited parking removal reduces journey times by 2024 with all planned development to below 2018 times with a saving of 149 and 89 seconds in the AM and PM peaks respectively (Appeal decision para 23). The inspector rejected AECOM's parking study as "unlike the appellant's VISSIM model, the AECOM study was not validated in terms of being tested against actual flow data" (para 25).</p> <p>The fact is local "planned" housing growth has already been granted based on using spare highway capacity and improving it by local interventions - limited parking removal.</p> <p>Further parking removal and increased enforcement of the weight limit have not been considered by AECOM.</p> <p>Concerning traffic growth across Watlington, AECOM notes the location is not a strategic transport corridor being connected by B-roads (designated in LTP4 as for local journeys), more rural unclassified lanes, a network of public rights of way and some rural bus services. There is no access to rail services in Watlington.</p> <p>An important omission from AECOM's report is the environmental weight limit that covers a large area of rural roads around Watlington. The weight limit has been enforced by the county council for decades and this will remain unchanged.</p> <p>There should be consideration that Watlington is not on a strategic transport corridor, and is not a location identified for employment growth, or exceptional housing growth. Benefits from investment in a transport scheme in such a location are considerably limited.</p> <p>How has Watlington's location been considered in relation to economic objectives and the statutory duty to consider best value?</p> <p>2.4.60 (3). Facilitate active travel within and around Watlington</p> <p>It is difficult to understand how a relief road that will increase private car trips and possibly HGVs on local rural roads, including a lot more through traffic reassigning to use a new road, encourages active travel. Parking layout in Shirburn St and Couching St discourages cycling in the town centre. Within the</p>	

<p>46</p>	<p>2.3 Data Review, 3 Policy Context and Objectives, 4 Option Generation & 5 Option Sifting</p> <p>The relatively high carbon option taken forward (Option E) is based on a very backward looking selection of data sources, most of which are from before declaration of a climate emergency. Some are from before the government's 'net-zero' commitment of reducing climate change emissions to 100% lower than the 1990 baseline. This policy has a statutory footing in section 1 of the Climate Change Act 2008 (2050 Target Amendment) Order 2019. All layers of local government have declared climate emergencies.</p> <p>Option E compared to Option G has high embodied carbon from construction, in particular the section to be built through flood zone. It has high operational carbon as it will encourage individual private car use.</p> <p>Generally all climate aware transport planning, including in Oxfordshire, is not to provide fully for increased demand by cars and freight vehicles for road capacity. The worsening effects on climate change of Option E a relief road, an intervention that locks in private car use, have not been accurately assessed. The reason given for rejecting Option G is not factually correct. Option G facilitates all planned housing, it has a positive effect on congestion taking account of wider growth at locations including Chalgrove and expert evidence shows because of the street canyon where exceedances have been recorded historically, it is the most effective intervention for air quality.</p> <p>There is no explanation why more recent climate change policies and recommendations have not been included. Transport is the single biggest carbon emitting sector.</p>	
<p>47</p>	<p>Examples of national policies and advice omitted from AECOM's analysis -</p> <p>The DfT Decarbonising Transport, March 2020, is omitted as is "Policies for the Sixth Carbon Budget and Net Zero", December 2020, by the government advisory body on climate change, the Committee on Climate Change (CCC). The sixth carbon budget and DfT policy emphasise that the transport sector has to move from thirty years of failing to reduce its emissions to a rapid trajectory of emissions reduction. The Sixth Carbon Budget and DfT Decarbonising Transport strengthens schemes to support walking, cycling and public transport to reduce demand for private car trips. A relief road achieves the opposite, with many costs. The carbon budget report says:</p> <p>" The public sector should lead the shift to other positive behaviours that reduce travel demand, for example encouraging home-working, facilitated through prioritising broadband investments over road network expansion.</p> <p>CCC said its research "suggested that spatial planning was one of the biggest opportunities that local authorities have to deliver net zero"</p>	

48	<p>Spatial planning of LP2035 allocates proportionate growth at Watlington as a larger village in the settlement hierarchy which will have limited services and local employment and is a relatively unsustainable location compared to towns, the Science Vale growth corridor and sites close to Oxford city.</p> <p>Evaluating a strategic transport scheme has to emphasise the spatial and strategic over the local. See Atkins' Oxfordshire strategic traffic modelling, July 2020:</p> <p>"In the evening peak hour along the M40/A40 corridor, the model suggests a slight reduction in trips along the M40/A40 corridor. This is likely to be related to the incorporation of the Stadhampton and Watlington bypasses on the B480, with a certain percentage of traffic potentially diverted from the M40."</p>	
49	<p>Oxfordshire County Council's draft Local Transport and Connectivity Plan</p> <p>It is not mentioned. It says:</p> <p>"Our Local Transport Plan Vision is for a net-zero Oxfordshire Transport system that enables the county to thrive as one of the world's leading innovation economies, whilst supporting clean growth, protecting our rich and varied natural and historic environment and being better for health and well-being, social inclusivity and education. Our Plan sets out to achieve this by reducing the need to travel, securing high quality gigabit connectivity, and by discouraging unnecessary individual private vehicle use through making active travel, public and shared transport the natural first choice."</p>	
50	<p>South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2035</p> <p>AECOM refers to the development plan as the "South Oxfordshire District Council Local Plan 2034". Before adoption, LP 2034 was modified and the adopted version is the South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2035. New policies were added to cut emissions from housing and transport in recognition of the need to mitigate and adapt for climate change and the importance of local plans in meeting net zero. The fund does not alter any of the statutory functions, duties and rights such as the allocation of housing sites through the local planning authority's plan making powers.</p>	Noted
51	<p>Chalgrove Airfield</p> <p>A relief road at Watlington would serve the housing led strategic site included in LP2035 at Chalgrove Airfield. It is linked to Policy STRAT 7 Chalgrove Airfield in LP2035.</p> <p>Monitoring of the WNDP is linked to progress of the residential development at Chalgrove Airfield (WNDP Monitoring 8.2).</p> <p>There is considerable uncertainty the airfield development will proceed. The Civil Aviation Authority has recommended it is discontinued in a strongly worded and detailed objection. An outline planning application is due to be decided by 16th April 2021.</p> <p>Highway infrastructure that is required to make development at the airfield acceptable is a matter for a planning application. It is likely that agreement, assuming some way forward is found, which seems most unlikely, will take several years and currently depends on a Compulsory Purchase Order the outcome of which can't be certain.</p>	Noted
52	<p>The Environment Agency has made the planning authority aware of its requirements for any route through flood zone e.g. EA response to P19/S4585/O</p>	We have consulted with the Environment Agency on the proposals and will continue to do so as the project progresses
53	<p>Oxfordshire County Council may not intend using compulsory purchase powers but rely on land being transferred to it for a peppercorn amount for the county to construct sections in return for planning permission for a certain number of dwellings should a relief road go ahead. Are such arrangements allowed under CIL Regulations?</p>	Yes

54	The Parish Meeting still requests an explanation of the lack of due and proper consultation on this report, the serious delays in providing responses to perfectly reasonable questions and the cancelling of previous arranged consultations. This has denied the Parish Meeting their proper access to question and discuss the options.	OCC has offered to meet the Parish to discuss elements of the optioneering, and they chose not to attend meetings. It was explained at the time that the questions would be answered when the OAR was complete as the work was ongoing at the time and it wasn't appropriate to comment at the time.
55	Given the time taken by Oxfordshire County Council/AECOM to produce the OAR it is impossible with the two weeks allowed for detailed meaningful and evidenced based comments to be made. Certain information was not published with the main report and we had to request this. This consultation has been limited to stakeholders only and not the wider residents who will be impacted by this proposal.	The information not provided was explained in the email where it was clear this could be made available if requested. When a planning application is prepared there will be an opportunity for the general public to comment although most of the views of the immediate residents will be conveyed through the Parish Councils. Specific residents immediately impacted by the road have been consulted as part of this process.
56	The statistical information particularly on highways and traffic generation is out of date and does not reflect the up to date position in particular on the number of serious accidents in Shirburn Village not all of which are accurately recorded on the formal record.	If traffic data is not recorded then it cannot be used.
57	Confirmation is required that the latest DfT's Transport Appraisal Guidance has been considered	
58	The OAR does not take account of the fact that the Oxford to Cambridge Expressway has been cancelled. This was said to potentially be a source of additional traffic volumes through Watlington by both Watlington Parish Council and by South Oxfordshire District Council in a motion opposing the road. Given that this represents a significant reduction in traffic volumes the Parish Meeting needs to understand how this has been taken into account.	
59	The recommended Option E is in conflict and inconsistent with the Oxfordshire County Council draft Local Transport and Connectivity Plan which has a stated vision " for net zero Oxfordshire Transport system that enables the county to thrive as one of the world's leading innovation economies, whilst supporting clean growth, protecting our rich and varied natural and historic environment and being better for health and well-being, socially inclusivity and education.	
60	The OAR effectively ignores the climate change emergency but sets out that Watlington is a relatively unsustainable , high carbon emitting, car dependant, rural location, hence its growth is limited in the SOLP. The option to construct the Watlington Relief Road will only increase from the additional dwellings as individual car use as the only realistic choice will increase.	
61	The recommendation within the OAR is not compliant with Section 1 of the Climate Change Act 2008 (2050 Target Amendment) Order 2019. The DfT Decarbonising Transport, March 2020 is ignored as is Policies for the Sixth Carbon Budget and Net Zero" December 2020 by the Committee on Climate Change. These require a rapid trajectory of emissions reduction, the recommended Option E will not achieve this	
62	AECOM have ignored the Ricardo report on Watlington. The OAR speculates without providing evidence of the long term benefits of the Relief Road. This was examined by the Ricardo Report with the conclusion "future compliance with the Air Quality Objective is not reliant on the presence of the Relief Road (Edge Road). Other reasons aside the proposed WRR should not be progressed on air quality grounds.	
63	Despite numerous requests Oxfordshire County Council have not demonstrated or explained why their position on the need for the Watlington Relief Road has changed from there being no justification to supporting the proposal.	

64	Appendix B (Cultural Heritage) confirms that no site visit/inspection of the recognised heritage Assets has taken place and that this is a desk top study which amongst other legislation/planning guidance includes reference to the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges of which Section 3 Cultural Heritage sets out the table of magnitude of impact on designated heritage Assets. There does not appear to be any consideration of the magnitude of impact of Option E which we consider will be "Very Large" in terms of the guidance particularly on The Shirburn Registered Park and Garden, the Grade 1 Listed Shirburn Castle, Pyrton Manor and the three Conservation Areas identified. The Parish Meeting has been asked to explain by the owners of the Shirburn Registered Park and Garden and the Listed Grade 1 Shirburn Castle why there has been no consultation, assessment or inspection with them direct, or in regard to the Conservation village of Shirburn, on such an impactful report and recommendation.	
65	Appendix B Section 6 states that the preferred option is for P3, P5 and P7 to place the road as far possible from the Shirburn Registered Park and Garden with P1, P2 and P6 being the least favourable. Option E as recommended then selects one of the least favourable routes. It is incorrect to say that views will be screened by the existing depot. Option E lies to the north of the depot and will therefore be in full view of the Shirburn Registered Park and Garden and ignores the views for the whole length of the southern boundary of the Shirburn Registered Park and Garden and also of the views and vista from Shirburn Castle.	Option E may be the least favourable to Shirburn Parish Council but it is supported by both Watlington Parish Council, Pyrton Manor and Watlington Parish Council. Due to constraints on the route other options are not feasible or favourable with key stakeholders.
66	Appendix C (Landscape and Visual) confirms (4.1.1) that any future planning application must include a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment. This must include Shirburn Castle as views and vistas are impacted as well as the Shirburn Registered Park and Garden and the Conservation Areas.	
67	There has been insufficient assessment and research of the heritage, ecological, environmental and air quality consequences of this proposal whichever route was chosen. Given the lack of time for consideration of the OAR the Parish Meeting reserves the right to bring forward further evidence based comment.	To date there have been predominantly DESK BASED investigations undertaken and FURTHER INVESTIGATIONS AND ON SITE SURVERYS will be undertaken during preliminary and detailed design of the project. It is not feasible to conduct all of the investigation work until a route is confirmed as there is a significant coverage area.
68	Appendix D (Qualitative Noise Assessment) states at 2.2.4 "that a central route through PYR 2, such as P2, may have the smallest noise impact on existing properties since noise exposure from traffic on the route could be mitigated on both sides by the future residential properties ... ". The OAR is effectively promoting future residential developments in order to justify Option E. This would be contrary to the development policies of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan and the Pyrton Neighbourhood Plan and the understanding of all stakeholders that there would be NO development on the northern green space of PYR 2. Therefore the mitigation would be undeliverable.	The OAR was considering this as no option, but it is not promoting this is the preferred option. There are no future proposals for housing north of the relief road through PYR2.
69	The proposed scheme totally ignores the statutory made Pyrton Neighbourhood Plan which does not include the provision of the Watlington Relief Road and the accompanying enabling residential development on PYR 2.	The OAR has considered the Pyrton Neighbourhood Plan, and OCC have worked closely with Pyrton PC to identify a route that it acceptable and maintains a green gap. Within the planning hierachy the SODC local plan which is due to be adopted shortly and includes the WRR carries more weight than the NHP.
70	Insufficient attention/consideration has been given to Options F and G. ("Do Nothing or Do Minimum").	
71	Decisions by South Oxfordshire District Council to grant planning consent for residential developments has been premature pending any formal proposal for the Watlington Relief Road. A proposal that Oxfordshire County Council opposed.	The consultation is for the OAR not the housing decsion, this has no relevance to the OAR work.
72	The OAR ignores the fact that planned housing growth has already been granted based on using spare highway capacity and improving it by local interventions, including parking removal in Watlington. This is done in order to enable AECOM to argue for speculative housing (100 houses on PYR 2) only to justify the Watlington Relief Road.	

73	The significant benefits of not proceeding with the unconsented Providence Land application for 100 houses on PYR 2 has not been considered by the OAR.	The OAR is an assessment of road options, not a report to look at the pros/cons of adjacent housing development
74	The SOLP 2035 does not require the level of housing numbers shown in the AECOM Report in Watlington and absolutely none in Pyrton. This is ignored by the OAR.	
75	The provision of the excess residential developments surrounding Watlington is purely to ensure that the Watlington Relief Road has sufficient developer led funding for what is an unnecessary road.	The scheme is funded from Growth Deal funding. This funding is provided to assist the delivery of new housing and infrastructure.
76	The Shirburn Parish Meeting does not support the proposal contained in the OAR and considers that insufficient consideration and attention to alternatives Option F and Option G has been given.	Noted.
77	Excess developments and the commercial gain of developers should not be allowed to override climate crisis, ecology, heritage, sustainability and the environmental interests and proper governance.	