



East Hagbourne

NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN -
2018 to 2033

Submission Version 17 September 2018

Consultation Statement

Appendix F: – Comments received from individuals

East Hagbourne Neighbourhood Plan – Consultation Statement

Appendix F: Regulation 14 Consultation – Comments received from individuals and our response

Each “ID” refers to one person.

ID	Policy / page no	Type of response	Summary of response	Change Plan?	Comments
14	Strategy C1, p57	Comment	Title does not describe content (not just medical services), but agree medical services included.	No	<i>This Strategy is intended to specifically address access to medical services, without being prescriptive about how that might be achieved.</i>
14	Strategy C3, p57	Comment	Follow up need for tennis courts ?	No	<i>Tennis is already mentioned in para 3, however it would be premature to concentrate more strongly on this one option.</i>
14	Strategy C4, p57	Comment	Encouragement needed for younger volunteers	Yes	<i>Words added to specifically include young people.</i>
14	Strategy C6, p59-61	Comment	<p>1. Pavements. Encroachment of hedges over pavements. PC urgently needs to insist that hedges are cut back to property lines to increase widths.</p> <p>2. Vehicle speeds. 20 mph limit for Main Road urgently needed. White gates would not have much effect.</p> <p>4. Lower Cross. Grange Cottage (?) hedge should be cut back to property line to give much better view for vehicles turning right from New Road to Main Road (also giving more width of pathway for</p>	Yes	<p><i>1. Words added to include overhanging hedges</i></p> <p><i>2. The objective of a 20mph speed limit is already highlighted.</i></p> <p><i>4. Overhanging hedges are covered in 1. OCC input and advice would be important in assessing measures to improve the Lower Cross junction, building on the experience from the Parish Plan.</i></p>

EHNP Consultation Statement Appendix F

ID	Policy / page no	Type of response	Summary of response	Change Plan?	Comments
			pedestrians). (See also Policy TA1 p40).		
14	Strategy	Comment	An additional need: to compose, maintain and publicise a more-comprehensive web site.	Yes	<i>A new and improved web site has just been launched. The help of the local community will be important to populate it with the right sort of information. A comment has been added to Strategy C4.</i>
14	Policy VC3, p30	Support	Light pollution limitation - a good policy	No	<i>Thank you</i>
14	Policy H2, p32	Support	Housing. Agree that more affordable housing needed to maintain spread of type of population in village. Also more 2-bedroom housing needed.	No	<i>Thank you</i>
14	Policy CF2, p37/38	Comment (as a member of the shop committee)	Mainly agree with this statement but more importance could be given to the Post Office in its present form (i.e. a salaried postmaster and a secure environment), maintaining that form, and the relationship to the shop	Yes	<i>Text modified to explain the interaction of the two components more clearly.</i>
14	Policy TA2, p40	Comment	Agreed, provision and maintenance of footpaths is especially important for a village. Should there be a policy to install a footpath from Main Road/ Manor Farm Lane to the cemetery and on to the steps up to the old railway line (present access along the verge of road is hazardous)?	Yes	<i>A sentence has been added to the explanatory text highlighting the area of Main Road referred to. However the policy exists to guide new developments so a requirement to create a specific footpath is not appropriate.</i>
14	New proposal	Comment	Employ a person, casual or part-time, to clear road gutters, maintain footpaths, clear litter, maintain flower beds at entrances to village, etc.	No	<i>This is more a matter for village maintenance than planning policy. The Parish Council is currently looking into recruiting a person to carry out jobs of this nature.</i>
14	New proposal	Comment	Should there be a policy to encourage and enhance biking in the village and beyond, e.g. bike routes to Didcot and surrounding villages, particularly to	Yes	<i>The promotion of sustainable modes of transport is an important concern in planning policies in the NPPF.</i>

ID	Policy / page no	Type of response	Summary of response	Change Plan?	Comments
			Blewbury ?		<p><i>New developments are required by Policy TA2 to connect to walking and cycling routes, but cannot require new infrastructure off-site</i></p> <p><i>We have added encouragement of cycling to the Community Needs section</i></p>
17	General	Support	Having read the plan I would agree with the content	No	<i>Thank you</i>
18	Policy H3, p34.	Object	<p>Response to report on the public meeting held at the East Hagbourne Pavilion on 11 January 2018:</p> <p>Looking at the first two screening criteria, I think that without significant connecting road construction or severe restriction on the number of dwellings and population, the land adjacent to the Village Hall will not meet them.</p> <p>A significant influx of residents in that area would best be served by more than one ingress/egress on Main Road. Even if a one-way horseshoe approach were taken to provide a separate entrance and separate exit to the area, both will be dangerously close to the school.</p>	No	<p><i>The screening criteria referred to are:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>- would development here relate to or integrate with village?</i> <i>- is the site accessible to village by road and footpath?</i> <p><i>The site evaluation (supporting documents, 'EHNP Allocation Process Consolidated Results' Attachment 3, pages 64-65) considered that the location of the site close to the school and village centre would encourage integration.</i></p> <p><i>The evaluation recognised the challenge of providing safe access to the site, however OCC and SODC have considered that this can be engineered, although the details have not yet been worked out.</i></p> <p><i>The need for a safe access to the site is recognised on p35 of the report, but requires professional input and the NP should not make prescriptive proposals.</i></p>

ID	Policy / page no	Type of response	Summary of response	Change Plan?	Comments
18	Policy H3, p34.	Comment	Perhaps a connecting road from the Didcot end of the area to Green Close and Green Road in Didcot, which would in essence connect Main Road to Green Close/Green Road? This might ease or increase the pressure of traffic on Main Road.	No	<i>Connecting the development to Didcot in this way would be contrary to Policy VC1a – Preserving the green gap between East Hagbourne and Didcot.</i>
18	Policy H3, p34.	Comment	Has consideration been given to moving the facilities on the Recreation Ground to the land adjacent to the Village Hall and allowing residential development on the vacated Recreation Ground?	No	<i>A new Pavilion was erected on the Recreation Ground and opened by Ed Vaizey, MP in January 2016. In considering the design and location of this facility, the option of moving facilities to the area of the village hall was reviewed and considered unfeasible.</i>
18	Policy H3, p34.	Comment	The option of the single paddock off Baker's Lane seems even more contrary to the first two screening criteria. If it were opened for development and some connecting road to Green Close/Green Road were constructed, it would still not be integrated with the village, access would still be constricted and it would likely be better served by Didcot thanby East Hagbourne.	No	<i>We agree that Bakers Lane paddock A is not suitable for development. The site evaluation (supporting documents, 'EHNP Allocation Process Consolidated Results' Attachment 3, pages 60-61) concluded that it was not suitable for allocation.</i>
18	Policy H3, p34.	Comment	The land behind Blewbury Road seems closest to meeting the first two criteria, albeit the distance from the centre of the village presents a challenge for integration.	No	<i>The land behind Blewbury Road (Site 2, East Tadley Field A) did meet the evaluation criteria, but both the evaluation (see summary in pages 34-35 of the NP report) found that Site 5 was the preferred site and this was supported by the evaluation in the SEA (Appendix 10 to the Report).</i>
18	Policy E1b, p49	Support	I agree with the six areas prioritized for classification as "Local Green Space". Thanks to the Steering Group and Community Group for the considerable work and efforts to	No	<i>Thank you.</i>

ID	Policy / page no	Type of response	Summary of response	Change Plan?	Comments
			discover viable options for us		
19	Policy H3, p34.	Object/ Comment	<p>Well done so far, however I feel strongly about the proposed shortlisting of Tadley corner. This runs right next to the overflow of Hakkas brook, and having spent this November helping clear that area, feel that any additional building in this area will add to surface run off and therefore increase flooding risk to Fieldside residents and other properties that are located next to the brook. This along with additional shortlisting of the site 200 meters north, will only increase surface run off on what is already a saturated flood plain.</p> <p>Fieldside and other homes located on the brook are already vulnerable to flooding so it is with great concern I raise this as a major objection to this shortlisted site of Tadley Corner.</p>	No	<p><i>We welcome your comments on the flooding background of this site in an area where soils become saturated after heavy rain and where there is a history of flooding..</i></p> <p><i>The Community Group included the site described as Site 6, Tadley Corner in the list of short-listed sites, because its suitability was unclear and it was felt that a full assessment was needed. The results of that assessment are shown in the supporting documents, 'EHNP Allocation Process Consolidated Results' in Attachment 2, pages 56-58 and the evaluation of the site in Attachment 3, pages 64-65.</i></p> <p><i>Flood risk from building in this location was included as a concern in the evaluation. We were, however advised by our professional advisors that only land in EA Flood Zone 3 could be ruled out on these grounds.</i></p> <p><i>The site was however evaluated as 'unsuitable for allocation', because of its adverse impact on the village setting and AONB and non-availability.</i></p> <p><i>The site is not allocated for development in the Neighbourhood Plan.</i></p>
20	General	Support	<p>The plan is thorough and well-reasoned. It should be of considerable assistance in helping us to direct development of the village in the areas where it will</p>	No	<p><i>Thank you.</i></p>

EHNP Consultation Statement Appendix F

ID	Policy / page no	Type of response	Summary of response	Change Plan?	Comments
20	Appendix 9	Comment	<p>do the most good and least harm.</p> <p>I have a quibble: Appendix 9 (Allocation) makes extensive use of colour in the tables;</p> <p>I could never find the key to the meaning of each colour. As a consequence, understanding the significance of many of the entries was almost impossible to determine. I believe that much of the impact (of those tables) was lost as a consequence.</p>	No	<p><i>The Community Group discussed carefully the way to carry out the evaluation and decided against a detailed scoring for each site on the grounds that this would be over-prescriptive and could potentially lead to the wrong answers.</i></p> <p><i>Similarly, we concluded that attaching rigid definitions to the colours would be over-analytical - they are intended to give a general evaluation of how favourable or unfavourable each site is with respect to each criterion.</i></p>
21	General	Support	<p>The team involved have gone to enormous lengths to be inclusive and widely consultative to ensure that this plan represents the aims and ambitions of the neighbourhood as closely as possible. I recognise that we are part of a community and as such, sometimes personal interests might be slightly different but that the neighbourhood's interests are more important. Therefore I am happy to heartily support this plan</p>	No	<p><i>Thank you.</i></p>
22	General	Support	<p>Congratulations on preparing a detailed and substantive neighbourhood plan for our village. We are supportive of all the aims and objectives of the plan and hope that it will help shape and guide future developments as is clearly the intention..</p>	No	<p><i>Thank you.</i></p>
22	Policy	Comment	<p>We note on p26 that build quality, materials and style plus energy efficiency are key factors when</p>	No	<p><i>We hope that we will be able to able to comment and have some influence when planning applications</i></p>

EHNP Consultation Statement Appendix F

ID	Policy / page no	Type of response	Summary of response	Change Plan?	Comments
	VC1b, p26		assessing planning applications. This may be possible for individual houses but can the plan influence larger scale developments when initial approvals are based on outline plans.		<i>reach the reserved matters stage. Time will tell whether this really is the case.</i>
22	Policies E1a, E1b, p43 et seq	Support	We support the defined allocations and think the identification of green spaces is important to maintaining the character of the village in the future.	Yes	<i>Thank you for your support. I think there is general agreement on the principles, but the details can be challenging.</i> <i>Changes have been made to the report to consider the best way to protect green spaces and .provide fuller justification for the proposals.</i>
23	General	Support	This is an excellent document and I fully support the plan.	No	<i>Thank you.</i>
24	Policy H3, p34, strategy C6, p59	Comment	Looking carefully at the (Greenlight) plan, I do not see any road infrastructure plans to deal with the increased traffic through the village via Main Road, only the listing of it as a potential problem. Before any home construction can begin, it seems to me that we need to see how it is planned to manage this increased traffic. Crossing Main Road now is dangerous due to obstructed visibility and speeding traffic. An increase in volume will intensify these dangers.	No	<i>The need for safe access arrangements in developing the allocated site are acknowledged on p35. The details of the Greenlight development should be addressed through the full planning application for the allocated site..</i> <i>The need for consideration of general road safety matters are covered in Strategy C6. We agree that increased traffic will intensify these challenges and that we are not in a position to prescribe a solution..</i>
24	Policy H3, p34	Comment	I appreciate the time that has been spent on evaluating environmental factors, such as green spaces, flooding and run-off, created by the new	No	<i>This information should be provided as part of the full planning application for the allocated site.</i>

EHNP Consultation Statement Appendix F

ID	Policy / page no	Type of response	Summary of response	Change Plan?	Comments
			construction, but would appreciate a full impact statement concerning increased traffic volume and pollution to adjacent homes along Main Road before construction begins.		
25	Policy H3, p34	Comment	I am happy with the proposed site for development but would not be happy for any of the other proposed sites being developed in the future without further consultation.	No	<i>Thank you, noted.</i>
25	Policy H3, p34	Comment	The only other site that does not interfere with the village is that at Tadley corner.	No	<i>Tadley Corner is not an allocated site and we would resist development there because of its impact on the AONB and because, as you say, it is not well linked with the village.</i>
25	General	Comment	I hope when the plan is in place development of peoples back gardens will be opposed strongly.	No	<i>We hope so too. The Government's White Paper "Fixing our Broken Housing Market" says it aims to ensure authorities can stop unwanted garden grabbing. Time will tell if this really turns out to be the case.</i>
25	Policies E1a, E1b, p43 et seq	Support	Happy to see all the listed sites for green spaces and support all of these.	No	<i>Thank you.</i>
26	General	Support	We applaud the progress on the Plan to date. In particular we agree that it is important that the rural nature of our small and historic village is not damaged by unplanned, speculative house building and the detachment from Didcot is maintained.	No	<i>Thank you</i>

EHNP Consultation Statement Appendix F

ID	Policy / page no	Type of response	Summary of response	Change Plan?	Comments
26	Policies E1a, E1b, p43 et seq	Support/ Comment	We especially support the lists of Significant and Local green spaces and we urge that these are protected in perpetuity.	No	<i>Thank you. The inclusion of green spaces in the NP, together with other policies, should ensure that they are properly considered and valued in future planning decisions.</i>
26	Policy H3, p34	Comment	We are greatly disappointed by the permission granted to Greenlight and believe that this will be do significant damage to the historic beauty at the western side of the village.	No	<i>While the NP has allocated the site next to Hagbourne Village Hall as the most suitable for future development, we too regret that the current permission pre-empted the Neighbourhood Plan and that we are not able to make specific proposals for how it should be developed.</i>
26	General	Comment	We beg that further breaches of the Local Plan are refused and that proper democratic control is returned to the local electorate.	No	<i>Because the Local Plan remains vulnerable to speculator challenges to the 5-year land supply, this Neighbourhood Plan is an important contribution to planned development in our parish.</i>
27	Policy H3, p34	Support	Regarding Policy (H3), Housing. I would certainly hope that allocating the Greenlight site for 74 houses under this plan fulfils East Hagbourne's growth commitment until at least 2030. As such, I support the housing aspects of the plan.	No	<i>Noted, thank you.</i>
28	General	Support	It is a well-rounded thought out plan that sets out clear policies and has taken into account a lot of villagers' concerns and aspirations.	No	<i>Thank you</i>
31	General	Support	The plan looks good so far, offering a sensible approach to future growth of the village.	No	<i>Thank you</i>

EHNP Consultation Statement Appendix F

ID	Policy / page no	Type of response	Summary of response	Change Plan?	Comments
33	General	Support	<p>I firmly support the plan capturing as it does the character of our village and seeking a route to protect what we have whilst facilitating measured growth. I particularly value the way that the many surveys taken during these last few years have been used to shape the plan; be they the Landscape Study, the Character Study, the Housing Need Assessment and the results of community surveys.</p> <p>The plan values the individual characteristics of our village and helps us to accommodate/facilitate growth that will enhance them.</p> <p>The Community Open days and the posters available in the Church and Village Hall enable us all to absorb and understand the many aspects of the plan whilst en-route to other activities.</p>	No	<i>Noted, thank you.</i>
34	General, Policy H2, p32	Support	<p>I agree and support the policies, especially policy H2 Meeting Housing Needs with the recognition of a demand and need for smaller housing for first time buyers and older people looking to downsize..</p>	No	<i>Thank you</i>
34	VC1b, p24	Comment	<p>I would change the wording of policy VC1b Retaining Small village character.</p> <p>Paragraph a)</p> <p>This current text leaves it rather open to interpretation and possible contention as to what</p>	Yes	<p><i>NOTE: this policy has been renumbered as VC3:</i></p> <p><i>The wording of para(a) has been expanded</i></p> <p><i>The change to para (f) has been incorporated</i></p> <p><i>[this para is now split out as a new policy VC2]</i></p>

ID	Policy / page no	Type of response	Summary of response	Change Plan?	Comments
			<p>benefits might outweigh the harm.</p> <p>This could be tightened to:</p> <p>“Development which harms character areas would not be permitted.”</p> <p>Similarly paragraph f could be changed</p> <p>“Views within the village, to and from the village, and of the wider landscape including views towards the North Wessex Downs AONB, should be protected (delete wherever possible).</p> <p>New development should not harm the views listed in Table 9 of the Character Assessment”</p>		
36	General	Support	<p>I think the Plan is a first class piece of work that is a credit to the small team who have worked so hard on it. The selection of the site that will meet future housing needs has been carried out thoroughly, with all options considered in detail and significant participation from many residents throughout.</p>	No	<i>Thank you</i>
38	General	Support	<p>I have reviewed the plan and endorse its approach. We need planned development in the village, not unplanned speculative development. . . It is hoped a properly developed and agreed local plan will stop this from happening - and not a moment too soon.</p>	No	<i>Thank you</i>

EHNP Consultation Statement Appendix F

ID	Policy / page no	Type of response	Summary of response	Change Plan?	Comments	Comments
39	General	Support	<p>I have read the report and support the proposals . The plan accepts the premise that there is a need for greenfield development but subject to the necessary constraints, to preserve the benefits of village life.</p> <p>I would like to put on record my admiration and thanks for the huge amount of work undertaken by the team involved.</p>	No	<i>Thank you</i>	
40	General	Support	<p>I have looked carefully at the proposed Plan, which seems to me to provide a sound basis on which to proceed in these challenging times.</p> <p>I think it accepts the need to have greenfield development in East Hagbourne, but on a scale that does not threaten the many benefits of life in this village. Planning the environment, particularly given the concept of a Garden Town status that is being applied to Didcot, gives the Community the best chance to generate the optimum solution for all its members. I strongly support the proposal</p>	No	<i>Thank you</i>	
41	General	Support	<p>There is a lot of material to review and there has obviously been a lot of thoughtful work volunteered by the group involved. Well done. The output seems sensible and I agree with the overall outputs. The allocation of housing sites is a very tricky subject. The encroach of Didcot is an existential risk to the village and therefore the highest of the highest priorities to address. In that context,</p>	No	<i>Thank you</i>	

EHNP Consultation Statement Appendix F

ID	Policy / page no	Type of response	Summary of response	Change Plan?	Comments
			housing sites, although preferred within the list of possible sites, should still be seen as the best but still not really wanted compared to other issues such as protecting coalescence, infrastructure improvements, and maintaining excellent views.		
42	General	Support	The plan looks excellent - I have no additional comments.	No	<i>Thank you</i>
43	General	Support	<p>Although my husband has commented, I would like to add my own comments. It is the least I can do given the evident hard work by the group. I drive to Milton hill every day for work. I have seen the damaging effect over the last few years of too much housing growth with not enough infrastructure to cope. I drive through our village and those adjacent still threatened by more houses. I hope this plan goes some way to stop the planning anarchy threatened by greedy developers. .</p> <p>Proper planning involves houses and infrastructure since people need more than a place to live. I believe this plan helps our local planning needs</p>	No	<i>Thank you</i>
44	General, VC1a/b, p21,24: TA1, p39	Support	The plan is an excellent set of policies to direct and control future development. In particular VC1a and b are essential and we should ensure East Hagbourne remains a village and does not become engulfed into Didcot.	No	<i>Thank you</i>

ID	Policy / page no	Type of response	Summary of response	Change Plan?	Comments
			I would also emphasis the points in TA1 as a significant attraction of village life is that people, including schoolchildren, can walk safely through the village.		
45	General	Support	A great plan, just a shame we still have to have the 74 houses by the school.	No	<i>Thank you</i>
46	General	Support	My congratulations on producing the pre-submission draft of the East Hagbourne Neighbourhood Development Plan, a most comprehensive document. I fully support the policies formulated in this Plan and my comments below are submitted with the purpose of suggesting improvements to the Plan's overall presentation.	No	<i>Thank you</i>
46	General, Report Structure	Comment	<p data-bbox="602 884 1111 922">Relationship between Chapters 3 and 4</p> <p data-bbox="602 938 1167 1040">Chapter 3 appears on first reading to provide background to the Vision, Objectives and Policy developed in the key Chapter 4.</p> <p data-bbox="602 1056 1211 1193">Three sections of Chapter 3 (Development Context (3.3), Land for future housing allocation (3.4) and Village Character (3.5) address topics which are rightly dealt with at some length in Chapter 4</p> <p data-bbox="602 1209 1137 1279">(This) raises the question as to what material should be in which Chapter.</p> <p data-bbox="602 1295 1205 1367">By the time the reader gets into Chapter 4, there is a feeling of repetition on the key issues of housing</p>	Yes	<i>Thank you. We agree that the pre-submission draft was in need of some streamlining and have made changes to avoid duplication and in some cases put the points in a more logical order, without losing any key messages.</i>

ID	Policy / page no	Type of response	Summary of response	Change Plan?	Comments
			<p>and the relationship between this Plan and other plans.</p> <p>It is therefore suggested that all detailed material on the relationship between this Plan and other plans, as well as work undertaken to identify sites for housing be moved from Chapter 3 to Chapter 4, whilst background on the character of the village be moved from 4.3.2 to 3.5.</p> <p>It is further suggested that Section 2.1 be revised to better explain the structure and content of the overall document. (Should not the title of section 2.1 be the “Structure of this Plan” rather than “Report?”).</p>		
47	General	Support	<p>I am really supportive of the balance struck by the Plan in seeking to preserve what is valued by East Hagbourne-ites whilst also articulating a long term sustainable future for the village.</p> <p>The plan also strikes a successful balance between supporting the broader development goals of the District Council in general and protecting the special and unique character of a Domesday Village.</p> <p>East Hagbourne benefits from the modern, bustling services offered by Didcot. However, Didcot benefits having an historic, rural village on its door step. The fundamental complementarity of the two distinct settlements is recognised by all existing planning documents - the local plan, the emerging local plan and the Didcot Garden Town plan. Unfortunately, it is sadly ignored by the mass of unit</p>	No	<i>Thank you</i>

EHNP Consultation Statement Appendix F

ID	Policy / page no	Type of response	Summary of response	Change Plan?	Comments
			<p>dumping speculative developers gaming the system. The essence of good planning (and the essence of the NPPF) is not building anything, anywhere, but facilitating "the right homes in the right places". This Plan delivers on this goal. It has achieved its goal through extensive consultation with local residents, broad and deep technical surveys and studies and as the result of the passion, imagination and sheer hard work of a dedicated NP Team. I fully support the draft</p>		
48	General	Support	<p>After reading this plan I feel it is a well thought through, sensible vision on how East Hagbourne village can assist the county by providing housing stock while continuing to be a self-identifiable rural village.</p>	No	<i>Thank you</i>
49	General	Support	<p>It is of course impossible to please all of the people all of the time however, I feel the neighbourhood plan that is being proposed will satisfy the needs and concerns of the majority of residents of the village. I recognise and applaud the huge amount of work and effort that has gone into this project and fully support the "East Hagbourne Neighbourhood Plan"</p>	No	<i>Thank you</i>
50	General	Support	<p>The East Hagbourne Neighbourhood Plan is a vitally important document in which all aspects of this village have been thoroughly researched and</p>	No	<i>Thank you</i>

ID	Policy / page no	Type of response	Summary of response	Change Plan?	Comments
			considered in great detail. The Plan must have 'weight' in all planning decisions especially in the light of speculative planning applications and the fact the SODC Local Plan has not yet been completed. It is essential that East Hagbourne maintains its village character as well as planning for the future. This Neighbourhood Plan will help maintain the rural environment and character of East Hagbourne for future generations.		
51	4.3.2, p21	Comment	The preservation of a gap between the village and Didcot is essential to preserve the character of East Hagbourne	No	<i>Noted, thank you</i>
51	CF2, p37	Comment	The current infrastructure of the village does not support any major development	No	<i>Noted, thank you</i>
51	TA3, p42	Comment	Already there is too much on-street parking. Any new buildings should have off-street parking as part of planning agreement.	No	<i>Noted, thank you.</i>
51	Strategy C6, p59	Comment	The volume of traffic on New Road is already very high as it is the link to other villages and the town of Didcot and its railway station. The traffic is too fast and too heavy. Main Road through the village should be 20 mph.	No	<i>Noted, thank you.</i>
52	General	Comment	Thank you for all the work you have done for East Hagbourne. Housing need is for me small houses for people who grew up in the village.	No	<i>Noted, thank you</i>

EHNP Consultation Statement Appendix F

ID	Policy / page no	Type of response	Summary of response	Change Plan?	Comments
53	General	Comment	Overall I think the plan is excellent, with a good balance between trying to preserve the character of the village and a recognition of the need for more small, affordable homes.	<i>Thank you</i>	
53	4.3.5 Transport and Access	Comment	I am pleased to see that the traffic problems receive significant comment, and that the plan recognises the need for attention - as a resident of Main Road with a clear view of the daily problems, I hope that attention will be urgent.	<i>Noted.</i>	
53	p28	Comment	The Conservation Area collection of houses actually includes not just "mid/late 17th century houses..." but also 15th and 16th century. This means the collection of buildings not only has greater historical value, but is also more vulnerable to degradation from increasing traffic. The Oxfordshire Buildings Record recognises that a number of these buildings are important in the region (not just the District).	<i>Text amended, thank you.</i>	
53	p33	Comment	Not sure about the premise that special care units for elderly people need to be in built up areas so they're close to shops etc: green space and a homely feel are actually very beneficial for the elderly and disabled, so I don't agree that we should assume they want or need to be dumped into big facilities in towns!	<i>Point noted and text changed, but most people would not feel that being close to facilities was being 'dumped'.</i>	
53	p37	Comment	I don't think we should kid ourselves that the range of groups and volunteers in EH makes it "special": the description could apply to most villages in the Home Counties and SE England - nice, but not	<i>Noted.</i>	

EHNP Consultation Statement Appendix F

ID	Policy / page no	Type of response	Summary of response	Change Plan?	Comments
			special, I'm afraid.		
53	p40	Comment	Not quite sure how the statement that many people walk to school meshes with the comments about the overcrowding car park! 200 pupils (who won't all be arriving at the same minute) but 54 spaces not enough - suggests that actually not many do walk to school. I haven't spotted a "walking bus" for at least a couple of years.		<i>Agreed - text amended!</i>
53	p56	Comment	On the subject of the school, it's not mentioned in the infrastructure wish list, but any new development will clearly take it way over capacity: Other Oxfordshire villages have negotiated help for their schools from developers, and we should do that too.	No	<i>This is a matter for the school to comment, but the school currently takes a number of pupils from Didcot. There are already problems for school age children entering the village to find a place in the school, but for new entrants, the current capacity should be adequate.</i>
53	p57	Comment	Travel to doctors' surgery: the surgery for the village moved from the relatively nearby Mereland Road site out to Woodlands years ago, which is a long trek for the ill, elderly or disabled, with no direct bus - and if you think Village Hall parking is difficult, try going to the surgery!		<i>Noted.</i>
53	p58	Comment	Pleased to see the Fun Run gets a mention as a community event that draws people together. As you're keen to stress volunteer effort in the village, it might be worth including the Fun Run volunteers as the money raised goes partly to the Hagbourne Village Fund which exists to support local good causes.		<i>Noted</i>
53	p73	Comment	Tiny point, but significant: "access to high quality open spaces can make an important contribution to health and well-being" - for "can make" we could		<i>Noted</i>

ID	Policy / page no	Type of response	Summary of response	Change Plan?	Comments
			say 'is proven to make'; plenty of scientific studies show this. It is particularly important for children.		
53	Strategy C6 Transport and Road Safety		One thought rather than comment: probably not quite enough space for large vehicles, I suspect, but has anyone looked at whether the green triangle at Lower Cross could become a small roundabout?	No	<i>We refer to the Parish Plan 2011-2015 where the problems at Lower Cross were investigated in depth. The NP highlights the continuing issues, but we are not in a position to make prescriptive recommendations.</i>
53	General	Comment	And finally, an offer: I'm pretty good on wildflowers and trees, so if you do need more records on that front I'd be pleased to assist.	No	<i>Thank you.</i>
54	General	Support	Having taken the time to review all the documents, it is clear a lot of time, effort and hard work has been undertaken by the team in collating and submitting this comprehensive Plan. I have no direct comments on specific policies other than to say it is important that historic East Hagbourne keeps its separate identity and any development should be in a sustained and controlled fashion. As it stands I fully support the detail within the Plan	No	<i>Noted, thank you</i>
55	General	Support	Overall I fully support the plan. A huge amount of work has been put into its development and the Steering Group have made sure that the local community has been engaged every step of the way.		<i>Thank you</i>

ID	Policy / page no	Type of response	Summary of response	Change Plan?	Comments
55	Flooding	Comment	<p>Flooding: I note that a number of the policies (SD1, CF1, E4) reflect the challenge that the village has with regards to drainage and underline how important it is that any development does not increase the risk of flooding. I wonder if there might be scope within the plan to initiate improvements to drainage and actually reduce the flood risk in the area? The Didcot Garden Plan document published last year highlighted that Hakka's Brook is one of the three key natural drainage systems for the whole of the Didcot area and yet there has been little formal support for maintenance or improvement to the brook for many years now.</p>	Yes	<p><i>Good point. Policies set requirements for new developments. Developers are not normally expected to contribute to improvements over the existing situation, so it is not clear where this could fit.- the NP sets out requirements for developers and Policy E3 addresses the risks from flooding.</i></p>
55	5. Community Needs	Comment	<p>Facilities: It is regularly mentioned that our village is well served by local facilities and I would agree that we are fortunate compared to many other communities. However, I would suggest that we need to keep thinking of modernising and upgrading our facilities to make sure that the community is well served in years to come. In particular I would suggest that the excellent pre-school has achieved such high standards against the odds when it lacks a dedicated site and the community shop works wonders but is shoe-horned into a tiny space. It would be fantastic to be able to put more weight behind planning and upgrading our facilities and developing more of a thriving community hub (shop / cafe / work space etc) for the village.</p>	No	<p><i>Noted. Section 5, Community Needs sets out the main priorities. Solutions to to these needs requires careful consideration.</i></p>
55	Strategy C7	Comment	<p>Village Hall and Car Park: It is good to see the importance given within the</p>	No	<p><i>Noted, thank you.</i></p>

ID	Policy / page no	Type of response	Summary of response	Change Plan?	Comments
			<p>plan to the area around the village hall and car park. With the sensible allocation of the land adjacent to the hall for housing development, this site is going to become even more central to the village. I fully support the aspiration stated within the plan to explore ways to expand the car park which is currently struggling in terms of capacity. If more space could be allocated to the car park and village facilities in this area then it would be a major benefit to the village.</p>		
56	General	Support	<p>I fully support the plan. The large number of proposals for speculative housing developments on unallocated land clearly shows the need for policy VC1b to ensure the village retains its character.</p>		<i>Thank you</i>
56	Policy H2	Comment	<p>On policy H2 proposals for rented housing should not be significantly out of line with the current ratio of rented to owned within the village.</p>	No	<i>Thank you. Guidance on the type of housing needed and rented versus owned comes from our Housing Needs Assessment</i>
58	general	Support/ Comment	<p>I have read the plan, and fully agree with it. I am amazed at the depth and the amount of work that has gone into it, looking into every detail. I am also amazed that the government seems to have given up on put together planning and left it to small parishes to do the work for them, resulting in a patchwork of needs and desire in the way of housing, instead of joined together thinking and planning. It has result in developers hungry for land putting pressure on communities which would be better protected by the overall plan for the area as it</p>	No	<i>Noted, Thank you</i>

ID	Policy / page no	Type of response	Summary of response	Change Plan?	Comments
			was.		
59	Policy SD1 (page 3)	Comment	I agree with all of the points raised for considering development proposals. Some green routes to neighbouring villages are blocked by stiles - particularly south to Blewbury. These could be replaced by self-closing gates. For cyclists a track from Blewbury, through East Hagbourne, past the church to the Sustrans track at Butts Piece would make a safe and interesting route in both directions, and to Didcot. Sustainable Blewbury have been interested in this possibility for some time.	Yes	<i>Noted, thank you: Encouragement of cycling has been included in Strategy C6</i>
59	Policies VC1a/b and VC2	Support	I agree with these policies	No	<i>Thank you.</i>
59	Policy VC3	Comment	New development should have street lighting that turns on when it detects movement and stays on for 15 minutes, after which it turns itself off. This would not reduce safety, it would save money and it would be more natural for local wildlife. This idea has been taken up by European countries.		<i>Thank you. Comment included in supporting text to Policy VC3 [Note: this policy is now numbered as VC6]</i>
59	Policy H3	Comment	The developers of the Greenlight site should not be allowed to reduce the number of affordable homes they offered when asking for planning permission.	No	<i>We agree</i>
59	Policy H3	Comment	The Greenlight site could be requested to build with local wildlife in mind - e.g., all gardens built with interconnections for hedgehogs (a small hole in every fence - rats don't need holes, they are good		<i>This is a matter to bring up when reserved matters are discussed in the planning application - see policy H3</i>

ID	Policy / page no	Type of response	Summary of response	Change Plan?	Comments
			climbers). These are becoming popular in new developments.		
59	Policy TA1	Comment	New developments must not cause a severe (!) reduction in road safety' - I suggest replacing 'severe' with 'any'. Why would we want to 'increase' traffic speeds in the village?		<i>Thank you - wording has been improved..</i>
59	E1	Comment	I think the meadow in the cemetery should be designated as a Local Green Space until such time as that area is needed for burials. The meadow has great biodiversity value and has done for some time, the orchid population is growing, and the site needs to be protected from the well-meaning planting of memorial trees, which may not be native, and which would shade out the meadow and the dozens of species now resident there. Trees on the meadow would also prevent its annual mowing, which would then lead to the loss of smaller herbs as they would be outcompeted by the stronger grasses. The meadow is one of very few sites in the village where bees and other invertebrates can multiply in peace - providing pollination services for the gardens and allotments of the village, thus providing food for the village.		<i>Noted.</i>
59	General	Comment	The Great Mead Triangle is not being given much protection from developers. Now that the Chalgrove airfield site has fallen through there will be more pressure on us to accept development and this will have significant effects on our village character and infrastructure. Can it not be designated as a Local Green Space as well?		<i>It does not meet the criteria for a Local Green Space, however it's value is recorded elsewhere in the Plan and supporting documents.</i>

EHNP Consultation Statement Appendix F

ID	Policy / page no	Type of response	Summary of response	Change Plan?	Comments
59	E2	Comment	I would scratch the 'wherever possible' get out clause else this statement becomes rather meaningless.		<i>We have modified the text following suggestions from Natural England and SODC.</i>
62	H3	Comment	I have reviewed the material posted online and I think it is generally a very good attempt. Having said that I cannot see why some of the existing significant green spaces appear to have been sacrificed and allocated as sites for future development. (e.g. Great Mead South). I would expect SODC to jump on every allocated site given the total collapse of their own local plan (and the development proposed for Chalgrove Airfield) and I can see too much development happening and adversely affecting our status as a small village. I think serious consideration needs to cutting back on some of the allocated future development areas especially given the outline planning permission granted for 74 homes opposite the school.	No	<i>Only one site has been allocated for development in our Neighbourhood Plan - site 5, next to Hagbourne Village Hall.</i>
63	General	Support	I attended the first meeting organised by the East Hagbourne Parish Council on 8th October 2015 to discuss the preparation of a Neighbourhood Plan, and subsequently took part in consultation exercises and attended public meetings on this subject. With the publication of the Pre-submission Plan at the Consultation Drop-in meeting on 2nd April 2018, it was immediately obvious just how much time, effort and critical thought had gone into the plan by a large number of people in the community, many of whom have detailed technical	No	<i>Thank you.</i>

ID	Policy / page no	Type of response	Summary of response	Change Plan?	Comments
			<p>knowledge about some of the pertinent issues. I do believe that the 65 page Plan, with its numerous Appendices and supporting documentation, is a true reflection of the views of the majority of East Hagbourne villagers.</p> <p>Throughout the preparation and consultative phases of the plan we have been kept abreast of progress through the efforts of the Plan team; we were delighted to see how much effort had gone into the Plan Summary Boards at the Consultation Drop In, which gave a clear picture of how the team had developed its views. The team members were available to fill in much of the detail and willingly gave up their time by staying long past the time the session was due to close.</p>		
63	General	Support	<p>The Plan starts with a vision for East Hagbourne.. . it has the correct balance of safeguard for the village, protection of the rural environment and support for sustainable development to meet future needs. Regarding the latter, the potential sites for housing allocation appear to have been selected and analysed with appropriate expertise. The conclusion drawn in Appendix 9, entitled Methodology and Conclusions for Site Allocations on Page 9, is that the preferred site for housing allocation is Site 5, the Western Village Plotlands site. That particular site has been the subject of rumour of speculative housing development on and off for years ever since I moved to the village in 1975. It comes as no surprise to me therefore and I fully agree with the conclusion that it will provide the required sustainable development with the least</p>	No	<i>Thank you.</i>

EHNP Consultation Statement Appendix F

ID	Policy / page no	Type of response	Summary of response	Change Plan?	Comments
			adverse impact on village life or the rural environment.		
64	General	Support	Having taken a keen interest in development of the plan I must thank all involved in maintaining a robust, considered and comprehensive process. The broad range of factors taken into consideration and the depth of consultation ensure all points of view were captured, communicated and discussed prior to being included in the presentation of ideas for feedback by the community. This effort from all members of the community have ensured this really is a neighbourhood plan developed by those directly impacted.	No	<i>Thank you</i>
65	General	Support	I fully support the Neighbourhood plan for East Hagbourne. It is a well-researched document which represents the views of the majority of people who attended the open meetings that I attended. The proposed development site 5 lies within the envelope of the village and would add to this community.	No	<i>Thank you</i>
67	General	Support	Having read the East Hagbourne Neighbourhood Plan, I'm impressed with how thought out this plan is with regard to protecting the area from speculative land grabs. Which is presently the case with Blewbury Road Fields and the land east of St Hugh's Rise, both of which fall within the east	No	<i>Thank you</i>

ID	Policy / page no	Type of response	Summary of response	Change Plan?	Comments
			<p>Hagbourne Parish boundary line. At a time when the Didcot area is besieged with development, the East Hagbourne neighbourhood plan will hopefully inspire other parishes to do the same in order to protect their Neighbourhoods. Particularly relevant are Policies TA1 (Road Safety), E1 (Local Green Spaces), E3 (Recreational open spaces), E4 (Water Environment),CF1 (Infrastructure/Utilities) which are being ignored by Developers in their greed to make money without any consideration of the impact their builds will have on the environment. Well done to the Steering Group for their hard work in producing a sound and sensible plan and good luck!</p>		
71	General	Support	<p>I fully support what the East Hagbourne Neighbourhood Plan is trying to achieve. As a village, we have been placed in difficult circumstances with speculative developers trying to threaten the benefits of living in a rural environment. The Neighbourhood Plan is our only instrument to steer the village towards a favourable future. I hope the Plan is taken into consideration in future planning decisions.</p>	No	<i>Thank you</i>
73	E1a	Comment	<p>The wording of policy E1a should be amended to make it consistent with the application of Conservation Area controls to preserve and enhance the character that is being protected rather than to enhance community value</p>		<p><i>Policy E1a is intended to identify green spaces of value to the community. The purpose of the Conservation Area is more specific: 'areas of special architectural or historic interest, the character or appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance'</i></p>

EHNP Consultation Statement Appendix F

ID	Policy / page no	Type of response	Summary of response	Change Plan?	Comments
75	General	Support	Thank you to all involved in pulling together this piece of work. I am impressed by the thoroughness, scope and detail of what has been brought together in the plan. There seems to be a balance between the necessary protection of a precious environment in all its aspects and the flexibility which may be needed in the future. There is inclusiveness of a wide range of population at different stages of life and with varying resources.	No	<i>Thank you</i>
76	General	Support	We would like to congratulate the committee on a clear, thorough and professional plan, . . . would like to thank you for your efforts to maintain it as the special place that it is	No	<i>Thank you</i>
76		Comment	<p>We have just a few comments on the plan, which we hope you will take in the constructive spirit that it is intended.</p> <p>These are primarily related to the way in which the Tadley field site is portrayed in the plan as a close 2nd to the allocated site identified opposite the primary school.</p> <p>We appreciate that the process has been followed as defined, but feel that the way that Tadley Field is presented in the plan is not aligned with the objections that were submitted by residents and the Parish Council, following the closer scrutiny of the application. For example,</p>		

ID	Policy / page no	Type of response	Summary of response	Change Plan?	Comments
76	p34	Comment	<p>on p34 it is stated that “the Steering Group and Community Group concluded that two sites met the requirements for possible allocation” and then go on to say why the allocated site for selected, without referring to the negative aspects of the Tadley Road site. We would like to see a representation of why the Tadley Field did not make the final selection – and in fact given the objections to the planning application itself, a statement that on closer inspection, the site was not considered suitable, highlighting the serious concerns that are associated with this site.</p>		<p><i>The key reasons for the choice of site 5 over site 2 are outlined in the text immediately following your quote (following Policy H3).</i></p> <p><i>The full evaluation of the two sites by the Community Group can be found in the supporting documents, "Allocation Process Consolidated Results", pages 64-65.</i></p> <p><i>The review by AECOM can be found in the Strategic Environmental Assessment (Appendix 10a) Section 6.4, p12 and following pages.</i></p>
76	p40		<p>On P40, we would like to see inclusion of the impact that a development on Blewbury Road would have on the Lower Cross/ War Memorial junction, and increased traffic in general, as raised in the objections from residents to the Tadley Road planning application. In the transport and Road Safety section, we would like to see reference to the safety of the Tadley Road site corner, which has similar visibility issues to the Lower Cross/War memorial junction.</p>		<p><i>This level of detail is beyond the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan and should properly be handled as part of the planning application for the site.</i></p> <p><i>[Note: this planning application has since been refused].</i></p>
78	General	Support	<p>My first comment is to applaud the efforts of the Steering Committee and the Community Group in producing such a thorough and well-engineered proposal. I was involved earlier in the process so I really do appreciate the amount of work that</p> <p>is involved in producing our Neighbourhood Plan . .</p> <p>I support the Plan and hope that it will be fully</p>	No	<p><i>Thank you</i></p>

ID	Policy / page no	Type of response	Summary of response	Change Plan?	Comments
			<p>adopted with the minimum of delay.</p> <p>The background to the Plan including the Village Character Assessment and Landscape Study give an excellent description of the village and its aspirations as expressed by parishioners in the many consultations and meetings that have taken place over the last couple of years. It is on this evidence base that the neighbourhood plan has been developed so my main comment is one of very strong support for the plan.</p>		
78	H3, Housing Allocation	Support	<p>I feel that this aspect has been handled in a very professional manner and the committee have gone to great lengths to be both thorough and fair in both assessing possible sites and then discussing possible housing allocations. I support the recommendations made in the plan.</p>	No	<i>Noted</i>
78	E1b, Local Green Spaces	Comment	<p>The designation of local Green Spaces in the Plan has been even more contentious. This again has been part of a long and thorough process, starting from areas felt worthy of protection by attendees at public consultation meetings. The two level hierarchy of Significant Green Spaces (E1a) and Local Green Spaces (E1b) seems very appropriate.</p> <p>I fully understand and have sympathy with the landowners of the Local Spaces who feel that unreasonable constraints are being placed on the future control of their property. However, the irony is that, in public meetings, they have stated that they do not plan to develop the land and that they</p>	No	<i>Noted</i>

ID	Policy / page no	Type of response	Summary of response	Change Plan?	Comments
79	General	Support	<p>appreciate it as a green space. The designation of Local Green Spaces is determined at a National Level and it is unfortunate that a more local interpretation is not easily available.</p> <p>Although I support the idea of having Local Green Spaces and think that they contribute hugely to the Vision as expressed in the introduction to the Neighbourhood Plan, I feel that it could be emphasised that this is the current situation and any implication that such a designation would last in perpetuity should be avoided or even explicitly declared not to be so. As has been frequently mentioned, the Neighbourhood Plan is organic and will be (and will needs be) amended on at least a quinquennial basis.</p> <p>I would hope that an amicable agreement could then be reached with landowners of the proposed green spaces all of which I do feel contribute to the character and ambience of the village.</p> <p>I certainly sincerely hope that the two issues that I have just discussed do not delay the acceptance of a plan that I think offers a real viable future for the village in determining future growth in a way that fulfils the Vision that has driven the development of the plan since its inception. In particular, it is vital that we can get protection against speculative developments....</p>	No	<i>Thank you</i>

EHNP Consultation Statement Appendix F

ID	Policy / page no	Type of response	Summary of response	Change Plan?	Comments
			<p>hard to produce the plan for our village. It is very comprehensive and covers most of the important issues that we should be concerned about in order to keep our village community and setting as a village and separate from the increasing growth of Didcot.</p>		
80	General	Support	<p>The plan covers all the important issues and there has been effective previous consultation in the village. Preferred housing site allocation is a difficult issue, but the plan has looked at the sites in an objective way and in line with the District Council guidelines for small villages. It has also looked at other aspects of the village including transport and the environment. The plan is an impressive and thorough piece of work.</p>	No	<i>Thank you</i>
81	General	Support	<p>We are pleased to see a thoughtful and concerted plan for the village especially if it will help us deal with the raft of speculative planning applications that we have seen over the last couple of years.</p> <p>. . . We hope that his plan which includes allocation of over 70 houses should now satisfy any further need for development and act as deterrent for future speculative development. We trust SODC take this plan and use it to help protect our village.</p>		<i>Thank you</i>

ID	Policy / page no	Type of response	Summary of response	Change Plan?	Comments
81	E1a/E1b	Comment	<p>We are very happy to see protection being sought for small areas of land such as Great Mead and heritage assets such as the orchard etc. as this is vital to the character of the village and for the protection of the environment.</p> <p>Bordering on the open land of Great Mead we particular value the wildlife this brings and the use of the land for horses contributes to the character of village life. We feel would like to see Great Mead recognised and protected in the same as other Local Green spaces (Policy E1B) as this is an important space for the area and development would not only impact the local housing but also the recreation ground and the pavilion</p>	No	<p><i>Thank you. Great Mead does not meet the requirements for designation as a Local Green Space, however we have recognised its character elsewhere in the Plan and supporting documents..</i></p>
82	General	Comment	<p>Clearly an enormous amount of work has gone into the preparation of the Plan and its appendices. I would support any move which helps to preserve EH's village-ness, whether that be the restriction of town-style housing or the limitation of heavy vehicles. I'd prefer that housing development, wherever it be in the Parish, might be of individually-styled housing to maintain the attractiveness of the village</p>	No	<p><i>Noted, thank you.</i></p>