



East Hagbourne

NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN -
2018 to 2033

Submission Version 17 September 2018

Consultation Statement

**Appendix G: – Comments received from Local Groups,
National and Statutory Bodies**

East Hagbourne Neighbourhood Plan – Consultation Statement

Appendix G: Regulation 14 - Comments received from Local Groups, National and Statutory Bodies and our response

Local Groups and National bodies who responded

ID no	Name	Type of response	Resident?	Communications
9	Hagbourne Village Hall (Richard Elliott)	Local body	Yes	Email of 01/03/2018 / web-form 05/04/2018
10	Sport England	National/regional body		Email of 01/03/2018
11	National Grid	National/regional body		Email of 12/03/2018
12	Didcot Garden Town	National/regional body		Email of 13/03/2018
14a	Shop Committee (Tony Smith)	Local body	Yes	Email of 11/03/2018
30	Chris Lakeland, Blewbury PC	Local body		Web-form of 03/04/2018
32	Pierre Fleet, Natural England	National/regional body		Email letter of 03/04/2018
74	Highways England	National body		Email/attachment of 13/04/2018
77	Historic England	National Body		Email/attachment of 14/04/2018
84	Environment Agency	National body		Email of 19/04/2018
85	Oxfordshire County Council	Local body		Email of 20/04/2018
86	South Oxfordshire District Council	Local body		Email of 27/04/2018

Contents

1. Comments of Hagbourne Village Hall	4
2. Comments of Sport England	4
3. Comments of National Grid	4
4. Comments of Didcot Garden Town	5
5. Comments of the Shop Committee	6
6. Comments of Blewbury Parish Council	6
7. Comments of Natural England	7
8. Comments of Highways England	9
9. Comments of Historic England	9
10. Comments of Environment Agency	14
11. Comments of Oxfordshire County Council	14
12. Comments of South Oxfordshire District Council	19

ID	Policy /page no	Type of response	Summary of response	Change Plan?	Comments
1. Comments of Hagbourne Village Hall					
9	General	Comment	The village hall serves both East and West Hagbourne, so is properly called 'Hagbourne Village Hall'	Yes	<i>Noted, this is made clear in the report, although for conciseness, the term 'village hall' is used as well. Capitalisation is only used when the full name is quoted.</i>
9	General	Support	For Hagbourne Village Hall: A well-developed plan which has our support	No	<i>Thank you</i>
2. Comments of Sport England					
10	General	Comment	It is essential therefore that the neighbourhood plan reflects and complies with national planning policy for sport as set out in the NPPF with particular reference to Pars 73 and 74. It is also important to be aware of Sport England's statutory consultee role in protecting playing fields and the presumption against the loss of playing field land.	No	<i>Noted</i>
10	General	Comment	Any new housing developments will generate additional demand for sport. If existing sports facilities do not have the capacity to absorb the additional demand, then planning policies should look to ensure that new sports facilities, or improvements to existing sports facilities, are secured and delivered.	No	<i>Noted. Existing sport facilities in East Hagbourne have spare capacity.</i>
3. Comments of National Grid					
11	General	Comment	An assessment has been carried out with respect to National Grid's electricity and gas transmission apparatus which includes high voltage electricity assets and high pressure gas pipelines and also National Grid Gas Distribution's Intermediate / High Pressure apparatus.	No	<i>Noted</i>

ID	Policy /page no	Type of response	Summary of response	Change Plan?	Comments
			National Grid has identified the following high voltage overhead powerlines as falling within the Neighbourhood area boundary: 4YG Route - 400kV from Moulford Down substation in South Oxfordshire to Didcot substation in Vale of White Horse. From the consultation information provided, the above overheads powerline does not interact with any of the proposed development sites.		
11	General	Comment	Gas Distribution – Low / Medium Pressure Whilst there is no implications for National Grid Gas Distribution’s Intermediate / High Pressure apparatus, there may however be Low Pressure (LP) / Medium Pressure (MP) Gas Distribution pipes present within proposed development sites. If further information is required in relation to the Gas Distribution network please contact plantprotection@nationalgrid.com	No	<i>Noted</i>
4. Comments of Didcot Garden Town					
12	Pages 11-14, 25-27, 32-35, 48-49	Support	Quotes and supports 18 specific extracts that support Didcot Garden Town and green spaces	No	<i>Comments appreciated.</i>
12	Section 5	Support	We would also like to commend and support the proposals within the Community Needs Section (Section 5), which we believe make good sense.	No	<i>Noted, thank you</i>
12	Figure 2.	Comment	Figure 2 caption is incorrect and should read . “Figure 2. Didcot Garden Town Masterplan Boundary (shown by brown line) and proposed green areas”.	Yes	<i>Done</i>
12	Policy E1a, p45-47	Comment	Show the size of each of the open spaces listed as significant green spaces.	Yes	<i>We have substantially revised Policies VC1a, E1a and E1b</i>
12	Policy E1b, p49	Comment	Review whether the six sites selected as Local Green Space meet the NPPF requirement to avoid	Yes	<i>Green Space recommendations have been reviewed</i>

ID	Policy /page no	Type of response	Summary of response	Change Plan?	Comments
			designating 'extensive tracts' as local green spaces		
	Page 11		The Didcot Garden Town Delivery Plan (October 2017, p257) recognises the importance of the landscape setting and proposes green buffers to the surrounding 'necklace of villages' around Didcot, citing the recent dismissal of the planning appeal on land between Didcot and East Hagbourne as reinforcing the role that open space plays in preventing the coalescence of Didcot and its surrounding villages.		<i>Noted - we have commissioned a new "East Hagbourne Green Buffer Assessment" to better define the boundaries of the Green Buffers based on recognised landscape criteria.</i>
5. Comments of the Shop Committee					
14a	Strategy C2, p57	Comment (as a member of the shop committee)	Success of shop financially is strongly dependent on the PO in its present form and the location on B4016. Services and stock are carefully and continuously monitored by the shop committee. The response in the NPCS contained much wishful thinking!	No	<i>Thank you for your comment. We understand the sensitivities in maintaining the shop in its successful format, run and staffed by volunteers and the challenges of meeting some of the aspirations expressed in the NPCS. For this reason, the strategy does not include proposals to change the shop arrangements. The Parish Council will liaise closely with the Shop Committee before any changes are considered or suggested.</i>
6. Comments of Blewbury Parish Council					
30	General	Support	Blewbury Parish Council fully supports East Hagbourne in its efforts to produce this plan. The work done so far is impressive and from our own experience we know that your efforts will be rewarded , A neighbourhood plan is an essential step in safeguarding what you have and influencing the future, Well done so far and we wish you every success.	No	<i>Thank you</i>

ID	Policy /page no	Type of response	Summary of response	Change Plan?	Comments
7. Comments of Natural England					
32	Page 18, Objective E2	Comment	We recommend rewording this objective to recognise the need to maintain and enhance landscape character.	Yes	<i>We have amended objective 3 to include landscape character.</i>
32	Page 19 Policy SD1	Comment	We recommend you add 'AONB' to the third point i.e. '...long –distance views towards the AONB'	Yes	<i>Done</i>
32	Page 19 Policy SD1;	Comment	We recommend re wording part of the fifth point to read 'Preserve and enhance' and to recognise priority habitat and the need to work towards biodiversity net gain through green infrastructure measures. Measures can include planting trees and other appropriate species to increase biodiversity and habitat connectivity.	Yes	<i>Thank you. Wording changed to incorporate these points.</i>
32	Page 38 Policy CF3.	Comment	We recommend adding biodiversity protecting and enhancing projects to CIL funding. For example, the enhancement of Millennium wood.	Yes	<i>Done.</i>
32	Page 40 Policy TA2	Comment	We recommend adding green infrastructure measures to this policy. Green infrastructure that lines new and existing roads, paths or cycle ways have the benefit of creating habitat, improving habitat connectivity and as a natural screening for new development.	Yes	<i>Done</i>
32	Page 53 Policy E2	Comment	We recommend re wording the first part of this policy to read: 'Development will ensure that existing wildlife habitats are not harmed, retaining and enhancing hedgerows, waterways and scrubland wherever possible to work towards biodiversity net gain'	Yes	<i>Done</i>
32	General	Comment	We would like to draw your attention to the requirement to conserve biodiversity and provide a net gain in biodiversity through planning policy (Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 and section 109 of the National Planning Policy Framework). Please	Yes	<i>Reference added in text. We believe the changes to SD1 and E2 address this point.</i>

ID	Policy /page no	Type of response	Summary of response	Change Plan?	Comments
			ensure that any development policy in your plan includes wording to ensure “all development results in a biodiversity net gain for the parish”.		
32	General	Comment	Natural England would also like to highlight that removal of green space in favour of development may have serious impacts on biodiversity and connected habitat and therefore species ability to adapt to climate change.	No	<i>Thank you, noted.</i>
32	New Policy recommendation	Comment	We recommend that the final Neighbourhood Plan include: Policies around connected Green Infrastructure (GI) within the parish. Elements of GI such as open green space, wild green space, allotments, and green walls and roofs can all be used to create connected habitats suitable for species adaptation to climate change. Green infrastructure also provides multiple benefits for people including recreation, health and wellbeing, access to nature, opportunities for food growing, and resilience to climate change. Annex A provides examples of Green Infrastructure;	Yes	<i>This element has been included in the explanatory text to policy E2</i>
32	New Policy recommendation	Comment	We recommend that the final Neighbourhood Plan include: Policies around Biodiversity Net Gain should propose the use of a biodiversity measure for development proposals. Examples of calculation methods are included in Annex A	No	<i>We agree with the concept, but do not feel the NP should be prescriptive on this point.</i>
32	General	Comment	Where Neighbourhood Plans could have significant environmental effects, they may require a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) under the Environment Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004. Further guidance on deciding whether the proposals are likely to have significant environmental effects and the requirements for consulting Natural England on SEA are set out in the National Planning Practice	No	<i>An SEA has been performed.</i>

ID	Policy /page no	Type of response	Summary of response	Change Plan?	Comments
			Guidance		
32	General	Comment	Where a neighbourhood plan could potentially affect a European protected site, for example a Special Protection Area or Special Area of Conservation, it will be necessary to screen the plan in relation to the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations (2010), as amended (the 'Habitats Regulations').	No	<i>This has been considered in our SEA.</i>
8. Comments of Highways England					
74			We will be concerned with proposals that have the potential to impact the safe and efficient operation of the strategic road network, in this case the A34. We have reviewed this document and supporting evidence and have no comments.	No	<i>Thank you.</i>
9. Comments of Historic England					
78	General	Comment	We welcome the brief history of the parish in sub-section 3.1 and the reference to the 47 listed buildings and structures in the village in sub-section 3.2. However, according to the National Heritage List for England there are actually 45 listed buildings and two scheduled monuments in the parish as a whole (whilst the supporting text to Policy VC2 states that there are 47 listed buildings in the Conservation Area)	Yes	<i>Thank you - the report has been modified accordingly.</i>
	3.2	Comment	We would welcome a fuller description of the special interest of the Conservation Area (the reason for its designation) – perhaps the “ <i>unusually large collection of mid/late 17th century houses and farmsteads with original barns attached</i> ” to which reference is made in the supporting text to Policy VC2 ?) and the date of the Conservation Area Character Appraisal in sub-section 3.2.		<i>A new paragraph has been added at the end of section 3.2</i>

ID	Policy /page no	Type of response	Summary of response	Change Plan?	Comments
			We note the reference to “ <i>a number of buildings, trees and views of local merit</i> ” being identified in the SODC Conservation Area Character Assessment in the supporting text to Policy VC2, but is there a formal list of locally-important buildings and features ? Non-designated heritage assets, such as locally important buildings, can make an important contribution to creating a sense of place and local identity.		<i>We are not aware of a formal register, but the SODC Conservation Area Character Assessment identifies these on the map, shown as Figure 4 in the pre-submission report. While not a part of this NP, the extent of the Conservation Area and buildings of merit deserve further review.</i>
			We welcome the references to “ <i>rare examples of medieval field pattern, ridge and furrow farming, a stock funnel, ancient farms and barns, orchards, and medieval archaeology</i> ” in the supporting text to Policy VC2, but consider that this would sit more logically in sub-section 3.2.		<i>Added to 3.2, but also retained in 4.3.2</i>
			Have the Oxfordshire Historic Environment Record and Oxfordshire Historic Landscape Character Assessment been consulted, the former for non-scheduled archaeological sites, some of which may be of national importance ?		<i>Records have been consulted as documented in the SODC and EHNP Character Studies. the SODC study notes: "If nothing has yet been identified within an area then this map will be blank, but this does not mean that the area is necessarily archaeologically sterile" - recent excavations in connection with development in the area indicate that there is a potentially rich archaeological heritage still to be discovered.</i>
			We welcome, in principle, the inclusion of “ <i>Will development impact the conservation area</i> ” as a criterion for the site assessment, although we would have preferred “ <i>Will development adversely affect the significance of listed buildings or the special interest, character and appearance of the conservation area</i> ”.		<i>Noted, thank you</i>
			We also welcome the reference to character in the penultimate paragraph on page 12 and sub-section 3.5 on village character. Historic England also considers that Neighbourhood Development Plans should be underpinned by a thorough		<i>We agree and believe that the EHNP Character Study provides a valuable and detailed picture of the NP area character, expanding beyond the SODC Study which focussed on the Conservation Area.</i>

ID	Policy /page no	Type of response	Summary of response	Change Plan?	Comments
			understanding of the character and special qualities of the area covered by the Plan.		
			Characterisation studies can also help inform locations and detailed design of proposed new development, identify possible townscape improvements and establish a baseline against which to measure change. We therefore welcome the undertaking of the detailed Landscape Study and Village Character Assessment.		<i>Thank you</i>
			Although none of the heritage assets in the parish are currently on the Historic England Heritage at Risk Register the Register does not include grade II listed secular buildings outside London. Has a survey of the condition of grade II buildings in the Plan area been undertaken ?		<i>We are not aware of such a study, which would fall under SODC responsibilities. However, we would welcome a review of historic buildings and of the Conservation Area, which we believe could be expanded.</i>
			Has there been any or is there any ongoing loss of character, particularly within the Conservation Area, through inappropriate development, inappropriate alterations to properties under permitted development rights, loss of vegetation, insensitive street works etc that affect the “eccentricities” of the old village that contribute to the “unique charm” of the Conservation Area valued by residents? If so, this could be identified in sub-section 3.6 “Our Challenges”.		<i>Our SWOT analysis identified problems from traffic especially heavy vehicles, loss/destruction of historic farm landscape including ridge and furrow and the viability of farming enterprises - we have added a section to 3.6</i>
			We note the Vision for the Neighbourhood Plan in sub-section 4.1. We welcome the references to character and historic village but we feel that the Vision reads more as a statement of the purpose of the Neighbourhood Plan. In our experience, most Neighbourhood Plans have a vision for their area in the future – how the community would like their village or parish to be. This then provides the rationale for objectives and the policies and proposals of the Plan.		<i>Noted, thank you. We feel that the Vision (slightly amended) reflects the wishes of our residents.</i>
			We welcome Objectives VC1 and VC2, although we		<i>Thank you - wording has been changed</i>

ID	Policy /page no	Type of response	Summary of response	Change Plan?	Comments
			would prefer “conserve and enhance” to “conserve and protect” as terminology more consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework and as demonstrating an intention to improve the historic environment where the opportunity arises.		
			We welcome the references to character in Policy SD1, but are disappointed that it does not require development proposals to show how they would conserve and enhance the historic environment as it does for biodiversity and landscape. The conservation and enhancement of the historic environment is an integral part of sustainable development as recognised by paragraphs 7 and 9 of the National Planning Policy Framework.		<i>This is covered in more detail in VC2, but we have also added a bullet to SD1.</i>
			We have previously welcomed the references to character on page 12, in sub-sections 3.5 and 4.1 and in Policy SD1. We also welcome the paragraphs under the headings “Character” on page 25 and “Build Quality – Materials/Style on page 26, and the paragraph on views on page 27		<i>Thank you.</i>
			We welcome, in principle, Policy VC2, although we would prefer “conserving” and “conserve” to “preserving” and “preserve” as terminology more consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework and as recognising that sensitive development can take place that maintains or even enhances the significance, special interest, character or appearance of heritage assets.		<i>Comment noted. We have had extensive discussion with SODC on this matter and hope we have now struck the right balance between "conserve" and "preserve" to everyone's satisfaction.</i>
			Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework states “...neighbourhood plans should develop robust and comprehensive policies that set out the quality of development that will be expected for the area. Such policies should be based on stated objectives for the future of the area and an understanding and evaluation of its defining characteristics.”		<i>Sub-paras on listed buildings use 'must' in line with Local Plan ENV7. However, we need to consider potential development in the wider area including outside the built area.</i>

ID	Policy /page no	Type of response	Summary of response	Change Plan?	Comments
			We feel that Policy VC2 does not quite match up to this requirement; it could be considered to not be robust as it only states that new development “should” “preserve or enhance the character, appearance.....”, not “must”, and it could give greater guidance on other aspects of design e.g. building heights, architectural features, plot layouts, boundary treatments, landscaping etc. However, we are satisfied that the required “ <i>understanding and evaluation of its defining characteristics</i> ” exists with the Village Character Assessment and Landscape Study 2017 (Character Assessment).		
			We suggest that Policy VC2 be split into separate policies for design and for the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment.		<i>We feel this works best as a single policy. [Note: it is now policy VC5]</i>
			We suggest that the supporting text for Policy VC2 (or for a separate policy for the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment as we suggest above) concentrates mainly on (planning strictly controlled in the Conservation Area) as the justification for the policy rather than repeating or adding new information about the history and historic environment of the parish, which we suggest should be set out comprehensively in sub-sections 3.1 and 3.2.		
	H3	Support do not object to its allocation.	No	<i>Noted, thank you.</i>
	CF3	Comment	National Planning Practice Guidance is that “A policy in a neighbourhood plan should be clear and unambiguous. . . . Policy CF3 does not relate to the determining of planning applications	Yes	<i>Policy CF3 has been removed</i>
	E1a/E1b	Support	We welcome the identification of Tudor House allotments and Lawson’s Orchard as Significant Green Spaces protected by Policy E1a and Local Green Spaces protected by Policy E1b given their contributions to the setting of listed buildings and	No	<i>Noted, thank you</i>

ID	Policy /page no	Type of response	Summary of response	Change Plan?	Comments
			the identification of each as an “Important Open Space” in the Conservation Area by the Conservation Area Character Appraisal		
			the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan offers the opportunity to harness a community’s interest in the historic environment by getting the community to help add to the evidence base, perhaps by inputting to the review of a conservation area appraisal (which could provide the justification for an extension of the Area), the preparation of a comprehensive list of locally important buildings and features, or a survey of grade II listed buildings to see if any are at risk from neglect, decay or other threats.		<i>We support the sentiments expressed here. The East Hagbourne Village Landscape & Character Assessment was prepared with significant local input and consultation. We would support a review of the Conservation Area and building condition.</i>
10. Comments of Environment Agency					
84	General	Comment	We note the Plan is seeking to allocate a site for up to 74 dwellings on Main Road. There is no map included to identify the exact location so we have based our comments on the statement that the site is located next to the village hall. This land is not at risk of flooding, or located close to any main rivers and on this basis we have no detailed comments to make in relation to the Plan at this stage.	No	<i>Noted, thank you</i>
11. Comments of Oxfordshire County Council					
85	General	Comment	The Plan refers to a number of appendices. It should be made clear that these are supporting documents and not part of the neighbourhood plan.	?	<i>Noted. This will be agreed with SODC before submission.</i>
	Strategy	Support	The draft neighbourhood plan includes one allocation for 74 houses, which is consistent with the outline permission P17/S2469/O. It appears reasonable that no further allocations would be expected given that the emerging Local Plan	No	<i>Noted, thank you</i>

ID	Policy /page no	Type of response	Summary of response	Change Plan?	Comments
			envisages less development than this in a village of this size.		
	E1b	Object	Policy E1b seeks to designate Local Green Spaces. While these are shown indicatively on Figure 7, it is not clear what the boundaries of these Local Green Spaces are, and that should be clarified prior to submitting this Plan. The County Council may have concerns about the extent of the Local Green Spaces	Yes	<i>Noted. Plans for green spaces have been revised and better documented. The number of green spaces has been reduced.</i>
	CF3	Support	Policy CF3 indicates that any CIL contributions arising from development in the parish will be used for the benefit of the community. The policy is reasonable in relation to the quantum of the CIL contributions that the Parish will receive (15%-25%). The policy cannot be seen to restrict spending of the District's portion of CIL. The County Council would be interested in discussing with the Parish any proposals for spending its proportion of CIL on elements of highway or footpath infrastructure	No	<i>Thank you - this offer is welcome.</i>
	VC1a	Object	Draft Policy VC1a seeks to preserve the green gap between East Hagbourne and Didcot. Coscote Fields, The Green Corridor, Lower End Field and Great Mead are specifically mentioned. Figure 3 (copied below) shows these. This policy appears excessively restrictive.	Yes	<i>Agree - revisions have been made to this policy.</i>
	Vision & Objectives	Comment	Although the vision and objectives have significant public health implications none specifically mention 'health or wellbeing'. - we strongly recommend that, where appropriate, the visions and objectives overtly make the case for development maintaining or improving the health and wellbeing of people living, working and visiting East Hagbourne. This is supported by NPPF paragraphs 7, 17 and 171. <i>(references to local data provided)</i> - Key public health points follow:	Yes	<i>Thank you, the text has been improved</i>

ID	Policy /page no	Type of response	Summary of response	Change Plan?	Comments
	Strategy C7	Comment	<i>provide opportunities for people to be more active - whilst we strongly support policies that seek to facilitate physical activity, such as TA2 – Footpaths and Pavements and E3 - Recreational Open Spaces, rural landscape and footpaths CF2 – Infrastructure - community facilities and the sustainable transport aspect of Policy SD1, we are concerned that Strategy C7 to ‘Increase the number of parking spaces around the Village Hall and School’ could result in less children walking and cycling to school. An alternative to providing more car parking in close proximity to the school could be to promote the development of safe walking and cycling corridors from peripheral car parks to the school and other amenities that could be used for ‘park and stride’ initiatives..</i>	No	<i>Noted</i>
		Comment	<i>provide opportunities to make healthier food choices - this could be used to reinforce the case for retaining the Community Shop and allotments listed in Policy E1b – Local Green Spaces.</i>		<i>Noted</i>
		Comment	<i>foster good mental health and wellbeing by increasing opportunities for social interaction/reducing social isolation and loneliness – we welcome the recognition in Policy E1 that human well-being is supported by community access to green space. This could also be used to support Objective CF1 to “ensure that village infrastructure and facilities support village life now and into the future” . We recommend that new or improved community facilities, public realm and green infrastructure should be multifunctional thereby creating opportunities for people to meet who might not otherwise do so. Creating an environment that encourages volunteering as set out in Policy CF2 and allows people to be more active will also protect and enhance mental health and wellbeing.</i>		<i>Objective E1 has been revised</i>

ID	Policy /page no	Type of response	Summary of response	Change Plan?	Comments
		Comment	<p><i>enable people to maintain their independence for longer</i> - this could be used to reinforce aspirations for a range of housing types that meets the needs of both current and future residents as set out in Policy H2 and help support the AECOM recommendation for “lifetime suitable homes” standards.</p> <p>The above are supported by NPPF paragraphs 7, 17, 35, 50, 69, 70, 156 and the PPG ‘Health and Wellbeing’ chapter.</p>		<i>Noted, thank you</i>
			<p>To maximise the behavioural change potential of active travel infrastructure and the community value of high quality indoor and outdoor public spaces, we strongly recommend that the early phasing of such infrastructure is highlighted within the plan.</p>	No	<i>Noted, added to supporting text for H2</i>
	General	Comment	<p>It is acknowledged (para 3.3) that the neighbourhood plan is being developed in the context of SODC Local Plan 2033 together with the Didcot Garden Town Delivery Plan.</p>		<i>Noted</i>
			<p>The draft NP states that East Hagbourne benefits from its proximity to Didcot Parkway Station however its access to bus services is limited and declining and those remaining are financially vulnerable. Remaining services will not be commercially viable unless patronage increases. It is therefore recommended that ways to promote the use of the bus more widely to the local community are considered. We support Strategy C5 which states: ‘Investigate ways of increasing bus services and their use by local residents’.</p>		<i>Noted, thank you</i>
			<p>The draft Plan contains a number of transport policies which are generally supported, for example in promoting sustainable modes of transport.</p>		
			<p>There is an identified need for more parking around the Village Hall and school. The provision of additional parking can however encourage more car</p>		<p><i>Added to Strategy C7.</i> <i>Note: The car park is the responsibility of the Parish Council</i></p>

ID	Policy /page no	Type of response	Summary of response	Change Plan?	Comments
			use. We would also recommend the development of a School Travel Plan to identify ways to reduce car use for the journey to school. We support Policy SD1		
	60		Page 60 describes issues with large vehicles and the possible introduction of a weight restriction. Consideration needs to be given to alternative routes that HGVs can use, as well as how a weight restriction would be funded and enforced		<i>Thank you, noted in strategy C6(3).</i>
			Further work would be required to look at the issues in the village and whether shared space and/or traffic calming would be an appropriate solution. It should be noted that proposals for any traffic calming measures need to be discussed with and approved by Oxfordshire County Council as the Highway Authority		<i>Noted</i>
			Similarly, an aspiration to reduce traffic speeds throughout the Parish is also discussed. More information is required on the roads where speeding is a problem, and how the speed reductions will be enforced. Any measures will need to be self-enforcing, i.e. some form of traffic calming is likely to be needed depending on the road / location.		<i>Noted, this would need to be discussed with OCC taking into account the extensive studies already carried out including under the Parish Plan.</i>
			The map below shows land proposed for safeguarding a Southern Didcot Spine Road in the emerging SODC Local Plan 2033. The County Council supports the safeguarding. The current Local Transport Plan 4 references this as the Southern Didcot road in Proposal SV4.1: 'Safeguarding and protecting the ability to provide a Southern Didcot road to relieve the B4493, southern residential roads and the town centre if significant additional development is allocated to the south of the town in the future.'		<i>We note that the land to be safeguarded lies only to the west of Park Road and that the emerging Local Plan supports this safeguarding.</i>

ID	Policy /page no	Type of response	Summary of response	Change Plan?	Comments
12. Comments of South Oxfordshire District Council					
1	End sentence of page 11/and first sentence of page 12-		The emerging Local Plan 2033 does not make specific housing allocations for smaller villages, but notes (Para 5.4.1) that smaller villages will look to the larger villages and towns for a higher level of services and facilities. This Plan will implement the objectives of the emerging local plan by: Please amend this paragraph to reflect the most up to date text as regards to the housing requirements of smaller villages as found in the Emerging Local Plan 2033.		<i>Recommended text incorporated. For villages with a NP, the requirement is for at least a 5% increase in dwelling numbers compared with the 2011 census, with an expectation of 5-10% growth where there is no NP.</i>
2	Page 13		" . . . the Housing Supply policies of the plan are out of date because the District does not have a 5-year land supply . . .". The district council currently cannot demonstrate a 5 year land supply of deliverable housing sites. This situation could change and it is important to reflect the temporary nature of this issue in the NDP text. The timeframe referred to may no longer be up-to-date. We suggest that a specific timeframe relating to the emerging Local Plan is not provided to avoid any confusion.		<i>This paragraph has been moved to section 3.3 and the text has been amended.</i>
3	Page 19 Policy SD1, Sustainable development		The use of 'must' in the policy is overly restrictive and unduly onerous. It is also noted that not all requirements in the list are appropriate to all development types. In light of the above, we suggest that: 'Development proposals must show how they.' Is changed to: 'Where appropriate, development proposals should show how they.'		<i>Thank you. The wording has been modified as suggested.</i>
4	Page 19 –		We do not consider providing the appropriate		<i>Thank you, changes incorporated.</i>

ID	Policy /page no	Type of response	Summary of response	Change Plan?	Comments
	Policy SD1		communications infrastructure including high speed broadband should be a role for developers. This is the responsibility of telecommunications operators. A reasonable expectation would be for the developers to provide the necessary infrastructure and ducting to enable these services to be delivered to new homes.		
5	Page 20 – Figure 2.		Didcot Town Boundary and proposed green areas map: Please provide a source for the map.		<i>Reference to the Didcot Garden Town Delivery Plan (October 2017) added as a footnote.</i>
6	Page 21 - Policy VC1a – Preserving the green gap between East Hagbourne and Didcot.		<p>We note that the supporting text for this policy refers to a community survey that presumably provides evidence of opinions about separation and rural character but this is not the same as providing evidence of assessed landscape values.</p> <p>in the context of the proposed separation policy, it might be helpful to refer to the District Council adopted, Didcot Garden Town (DGT) Delivery Plan, October 2017, specifically section 8.3.7 on formalising Green Gaps. The Delivery Plan outlines the location of proposed green gaps to the ‘necklace’ of villages around Didcot, including East Hagbourne. The landscape character assessment and green infrastructure work that this proposal is based on is available in the appendices to the plan.</p> <p>The green gaps shown in the Didcot Garden Town (DGT) Delivery Plan are a, at this stage only indicative, therefore it is important to identify/refer to any available evidence supporting your proposal.</p> <p>As it stands the proposed NDP text and policy do not sufficiently set out why the green gap is important or seek to refine the area to be protected. To help you overcome this issue, suggest you consider and use the Landscaping Character and Capacity assessments forming part of the evidence</p>		<p><i>Noted, thank you</i></p> <p><i>Text added</i></p>

ID	Policy /page no	Type of response	Summary of response	Change Plan?	Comments
			<p>base for our emerging Local Plan - available here. These documents will provide you with information about the landscaping value of the areas you are concerned about and help you refine the areas worthy of protection based on evidence.</p> <p>We can draw some important lessons from neighbourhood plans examined in our district. (examples give, including Brightwell-cum-Sotwell as a successful implementation)</p> <p>It is important to note that combined policies VC1a, E1a and E1b may be considered overly restrictive and unduly onerous. Examiners will normally delete policies that create blanket restrictions to development large unrefined areas and which are not supported by robust evidence.</p> <p>We recommend that the areas sought to be protected by policy VC1a should be refined based on landscaping evidence. The supporting text should also be amended to include more robust justification and references to relevant evidence for each gap</p> <p>Policy E1a should be deleted to avoid duplication or refined following the advice above.</p> <p>Policy E1b should be amended as detailed later in the comments. A plan showing each proposed Local Green Spaces should be provided.</p>		<p><i>Brightwell NP text has been reviewed and supporting text in our document strengthened.</i></p> <p><i>Noted. These policies have been extensively reviewed and streamlined. The supporting text has been strengthened based on the Character Assessment and SODC Landscape Capacity study.</i></p> <p><i>Noted, thank you. We have substantially revised Policies VC1a, E1a and E1b to add more robust evidence and remove duplication.</i></p> <p><i>See below (SODC comments 24,25)</i></p>
7	Page 22 – Figure 3.		Landscape Areas within East Hagbourne Parish: We recommend that figure 3 only identifies the Green Gaps once you have refined them taking into account the comments above		<i>Noted and actioned</i>
8	Page 24 – Policy VC1b		Retaining small village character and promoting good design:		<i>NOTE: this policy has been renumbered as VC1c, with para (f) retained as VC1b</i>

ID	Policy /page no	Type of response	Summary of response	Change Plan?	Comments
			<p>It is important to note that this policy is less detailed than the district council's design policies.</p> <p>Our conservation officer has noted that the character assessment you have prepared is exceptionally detailed and provides an extensive piece of evidence for the plan. It supports your design policies adequately and identifies specific features of local distinctiveness.</p> <p>We would encourage you to add a criterion requiring development proposals to incorporate the positive features identified in the assessment into the design of the development.</p> <p>As regards to terminology, we suggest the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Replace 'history of the village' with 'character of the village' - Change 'Build' to 'Building' and amend 'blend' to 'be in keeping' and amend 'blend' to 'be in keeping' - Replace 'should avoid harming' with 'should avoid significant harm to'. 		<p><i>Noted: we have added more local detail.</i></p> <p><i>Thank you! We will pass on your comment to the authors.</i></p> <p><i>Noted. Policy amended and supporting text strengthened.</i></p> <p><i>Done</i></p> <p><i>Done</i></p> <p><i>Done</i></p>
9	Page 26 – Build Quality-Materials/Style		Change 'Build' to 'Building'		<i>Done</i>
10	p27		<p>The Character Assessment should serve as the first point of reference for development decisions . .</p> <p>Please change to:</p> <p>'The Character Assessment should guide decisions relating to planning applications in East Hagbourne</p>		<i>Done</i>

ID	Policy /page no	Type of response	Summary of response	Change Plan?	Comments
			Parish where matters of design, heritage, the natural and green environment character.'		
11	p28 Policy VC2, Preserving Heritage Assets		<p><u>Comments provided by SODC Conservation Officer:</u></p> <p>I don't have any particular concerns about the heritage policy VC2; it doesn't do anything more extensive in terms of wording than the existing legislation, national and local plan policies.</p> <p>I note however that the character assessment they have done as appendix 5 is exceptionally detailed and provides an extensive piece of evidence for the plan. It certainly supports their design policies adequately and where conservation is a material consideration in a planning application, it supports East Hagbourne distinctiveness.</p> <p>On page 53 of the Character Assessment, the report identifies specific features of local distinctiveness. These are well evidenced throughout the rest of the report so I wonder if within Policy VC2 more explicit reference could be made to identified assets of local distinctiveness.</p> <p>Paragraph 3 of Policy VC2 could say: <i>Development affecting a listed building, the conservation area or locally distinctive features as identified in the Character Assessment must conserve or enhance the special quality and distinctive character of the parish. Development should also take into account any contribution that setting makes to heritage assets.</i></p> <p>As a side note in terms of terminology the NPPF says new development should take the opportunity to <u>enhance or better reveal significance</u>. The</p>		<p><i>Noted, thank you.</i></p> <p><i>Thank you - a para has been added referring to these locally distinctive features.</i></p> <p><i>Change incorporated</i></p> <p><i>Thank you for your guidance: the best wording seems to depend on the context.</i></p>

ID	Policy /page no	Type of response	Summary of response	Change Plan?	Comments
	Policy H3		<p>Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 actually says <u>preserve</u> with regard to listed buildings and their setting and then <u>preserve or enhance</u> with regard to conservation areas (not including their setting in the case of CAs). 'Conserve' as it is used in Policy VC2 isn't actually in the enabling legislation or National Policy. I suggest using the NPPF terminology as this is policy not legislation.</p> <p>In doing so, references to the character assessment should say that the development should enhance or better reveal the special quality of East Hagbourne as identified in the character assessment ensuring that great weight is given to the conservation of heritage assets. This approach would hook back into paragraph 132 of the NPPF.</p> <p>I have also noted that there are no maps showing the proposed housing allocation.</p>		<p><i>We have included "enhance or better reveal significance" in the final paragraph, which relates specifically to new development.</i></p> <p><i>"Conserve and enhance" has been used in para 1, to be consistent with Local Plan ENV7 & 8</i></p> <p><i>We have retained "preserve or enhance" in para 5, because this seems most appropriate</i></p> <p><i>Suggested wording included in para 2 of the policy.</i></p> <p><i>A map is now included</i></p>
12	Policy H1		<p>As our previous informal comments, we would suggest the policy is changed to:</p> <p>New residential development in East Hagbourne will be focused in the housing allocation (Policy H3), which will deliver a minimum of 74 dwellings.</p> <p>Development proposals which reflect the scale and character of the village, will be supported within the built-up area of East Hagbourne where it accords with the policies of this Plan and the Development Plan for the district.</p> <p>Development of new houses outside of the built-up area of East Hagbourne or outside of the site identified in Policy H3 will only be supported if they</p>		<p><i>Thank you. Wording adopted with some detail changes.</i></p>

ID	Policy /page no	Type of response	Summary of response	Change Plan?	Comments
			are necessary or suitable for a countryside location and consistent with the policies of this Plan and the Development Plan for the district.		
13	Policy H2- Meeting Housing Needs		<p>We would suggest that rather than referring to 'current and future households' to avoid any confusion, the policy text should read:</p> <p>'Proposals for residential development should, where appropriate, have regard to local housing need.</p> <p>Proposals should recognise the need for affordable housing, both for rental and home ownership, and reflect the particular needs of first time buyers, older people and those looking to downsize.'</p>		<i>Thank you, we have incorporated the text with some additional detail</i>
14	Policy H2 - Housing Allocation		<p>We are of the opinion that this policy is missing detail, for example is there anything that you feel should be addressed after the outline planning permission, that should be included in the reserved matters application or within any additional planning applications on the site.</p> <p>The text could be amended to:</p> <p>Proposals for the residential development of land part of Western Village Plotlands, Main Road (Site 5) as shown on the proposals map will be supported subject to delivery of a comprehensive proposal addressing the following criteria:</p> <p>And then list the criteria that should be met.</p>		<i>Thank you, text expanded</i>
15	p35		Amend 'dwelling' to 'dwellings'		<i>Done</i>
16	Policy CF1-		Infrastructure -utilities Paragraph 3 is setting out an administrative		<i>Thank you - para 3 deleted.</i>

ID	Policy /page no	Type of response	Summary of response	Change Plan?	Comments
			requirement (to provide information) which may not be available to developers. We suggest this paragraph is omitted.		
17	Policy CF2.		<p>Infrastructure - community facilities</p> <p>We are of the opinion that restricting development on the basis that it may harm the ability of a key facility to expand could be considered excessive and overly restrictive. We would suggest that the policy wording is amended as follows:</p> <p>Development proposals that will result in either the loss of or 'significant harm to a key East Hagbourne community facility will only be permitted where it can be demonstrated that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The facility can be better provided elsewhere in the village or no longer required. • The operation of the facility, or the ongoing delivery of the community value of the facility, is no longer viable. <p>Proposals to improve the viability of any key community facility by way of the extension or partial redevelopment of buildings and land will be supported, provided the design of the scheme and the resulting increase in use are appropriate in design terms and will not cause a significant harm the amenities of adjoining residential properties.</p> <p>You may wish to include some of the wording used for the policies CF1 & CF2 of the Emerging Local Plan 2033</p>		<p><i>Thank you, changes made as recommended.</i></p> <p><i>Suggested wording incorporated</i></p> <p><i>Noted, thank you</i></p>
18	Policy CF3		<p>Community Infrastructure Levy.</p> <p>A CIL requirement is a budgetary decision, made by the appropriate council, which cannot be committed</p>		<p><i>Policy CF3 has been removed</i></p>

ID	Policy /page no	Type of response	Summary of response	Change Plan?	Comments
			<p>by a neighbourhood plan policy. A neighbourhood plan document can highlight the infrastructure that it believes should be prioritised, but it cannot commit CIL receipts, from a particular development, to be spent on specific items in a particular area for example the community needs listed in Section 5. We would therefore advise that this policy is omitted completely.</p>		
19	Policy TA1		<p>Road Safety. We would suggest that you change 'should not give rise to' to 'should avoid'</p>		<i>Done</i>
20	Policy TA2		<p>Footpaths and Pavements. The developer's responsibility is to consider the needs of the people using the development and therefore we suggest the policy is amended as follows:</p> <p>'New development should protect the existing rights of way network and its ambiance. Where public footpaths or bridleways are routed or realigned through new development, they should be designed as part of landscaped wildlife corridors rather than being routed along estate road pavements as part of the highway network.</p> <p>Development proposals should also:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • encourage sustainable means of transport, including measures to provide for and where possible enhance the provision of multi-use pedestrian and cycle routes; • be well located to reduce reliance on private cars and instead to provide safe and convenient walking and cycling routes to local services and facilities and to offer a link to public transport services to destinations further afield.' 		<i>Thank you, the suggested wording has been adopted.</i>

ID	Policy /page no	Type of response	Summary of response	Change Plan?	Comments
21	Policy TA3		<p>Parking. Further clarification is needed as regards to where the parking standards and strategies referred to in this policy have come from.</p> <p>Clarification is also needed for the below point as it currently is overly restrictive and not clear on the approach it is trying to achieve.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> On-street parking or use of existing car parks will be avoided whenever possible; <p>The below paragraph should also be another bullet point not additional text at the bottom of the policy.</p> <p>Parking provision will minimise the impact of the private car on the street scene and reflect the character and appearance of the immediate locality as set out in the East Hagbourne Village Character Assessment and Landscape Study 2017 (Character Assessment)</p>		<p><i>The wording has been changed to align with the Local Plan and to be clearer.</i></p>
22	Policy E1a		<p>Significant Green Spaces This policy is considered overly restrictive and unduly onerous.</p> <p>I believe you have attempted to introduce a policy similar to W&R-BE1 (points 3 and 4) of the Whiteshill and Ruscumbe Neighbourhood Plan – available here.</p> <p>Such policy is only successful when an exceptional value is demonstrated and evidenced. It is not a viable mechanism for protecting all green spaces around the village. Such approach would not be appropriate and unlikely to meet basic conditions.</p> <p>We recommend that this Policy should be deleted</p>		<p><i>Thank you. We have substantially revised policies VC1a, E1a and E1b in the light of comments received.</i></p>

ID	Policy /page no	Type of response	Summary of response	Change Plan?	Comments
			or refined in accordance with the advice provided in relation to the green gaps policy.		
23	Figure 6		Significant Green Spaces: Please review, amend and/or omit this map in response to any changes to policy E1a		
24	Policy E1b		<p>Local Green Spaces: Following the Brightwell-cum-Sotwell Neighbourhood Plan Adoption and the policies that are now post examination we would suggest that the wording of Policy E1b is amended to be more simplified and not overly restrictive:</p> <p>'The Neighbourhood Plan designates the following locations as Local Green Space, as shown on the Policies Map:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Butts Piece and Parish Allotments • Green Gap Field and Surrounds • Lawson's Orchard • Paddocks to the South of Millennium Wood and along Bakers Lane • Pastures in Manor Farm Lane • Tudor House Allotments <p>New development will not be permitted on land designated as Local Green Space except in very special circumstances.'</p> <p>We would also advise that Figure 7 is amended to demonstrate the specific site areas to avoid any confusion.</p>		<p><i>Revised wording adopted, but we have retained reference to a specific figure in the report.</i></p> <p><i>The list of designated spaces has been amended after discussion with SODC</i></p>
25	Policies E2 and E3		Wildlife and biodiversity We would suggest that policies E2 and E3 are		<i>Policies E2 & E3 have been combined as suggested</i>

ID	Policy /page no	Type of response	Summary of response	Change Plan?	Comments
			<p>condensed into one policy and changed to reflect a more positive approach to development:</p> <p>'Policy E2 – Protect and enhance biodiversity and the natural environment.</p> <p>Development proposals should respect the natural environment and protect and enhance biodiversity.</p> <p>Development will be supported where no significant harm would be caused to important ecological-sites.</p> <p>Where appropriate, development proposals should include information that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • demonstrates the means of mitigating, preserving and where appropriate, recreating wildlife habitats and net gains in natural flora; • provides corridors of land within which public footpaths and bridleways of significant local recreational and amenity value are provided; and • incorporates Sustainable Drainage Solutions' 		<p><i>and also incorporating comments from Natural England.</i></p> <p><i>Aspects of policy E3 have been incorporated into policies TA2 (footpaths) and CF2 (recreational spaces)</i></p>
26	Page 53, Poicy E3		<p>Recreational Open Spaces, rural landscape and footpaths:</p> <p>There is already a policy referring to footpaths within the neighbourhood plan. Please consider this policy is necessary.</p> <p>Requiring the integrity of footpaths and field edges to be maintained may be considered overly restrictive and unduly onerous.</p>		<p><i>Accepted - include in TA2 for footpaths and in CF1 for recreational spaces</i></p>
	Policy E4		Water Environment		<p><i>Flooding is an important issue for East Hagbourne.</i></p>

EHNP Consultation Statement Appendix G

ID	Policy /page no	Type of response	Summary of response	Change Plan?	Comments
			<p>We consider this policy to be less detailed than our emerging policy – please see Policy EP4: flood risk in our emerging Local Plan.</p> <p>Neighbourhood plans should add value to the existing policy framework with locally distinctive policies. We recommend that you consider whether this policy is necessary.</p>		<p><i>the policy has been strengthened to add more local detail.</i></p>

Email sent to local groups

Dear xxx ,

The East Hagbourne Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group is contacting all organisations in the Parish, including yourself as a representative of xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx, to tell you that the Draft Neighbourhood Plan is now entering its Public Consultation Period which runs from 1st March to 14th April. (If you are not the most appropriate person please forward this email to whichever person in your group should deal with it)

This is the time when everyone in the village, or connected with it, can have their say about The Plan and we encourage every group to do so. We also hope that you will pass this information on to all the members of your group and likewise encourage them to comment as part of your group or as individuals.

What is in The Plan?

The Plan's vision is: To safeguard the individual character, vitality and community facilities of our historic village and protect its rural environment for the benefit of town and village alike, whilst supporting sustainable development that meets the needs of residents now and in the future.

The Plan aims to shape the kind, scale and location of housing development in the Parish. The most important features are contained in the main body of the Plan which explains the Policies we propose to meet our Vision for the future of the Village.

Once complete the Neighbourhood Plan will form part of the South Oxfordshire District Council Local Plan. It's most important aspect is that it will have 'weight' in planning decisions giving more local control over what and where development takes place.

How do I see The Plan?

You can access the Plan online at <http://easthagbourneplan.net/documents/> and a printed copy is available to read at St Andrews Church, East Hagbourne.

How do I make a comment?

Please submit comments by midnight on 14th April in one of these ways:

- *Complete the online questionnaire at: <http://www.easthagbourneplan.net>*
- *Email comments to: consultation@easthagbourneplan.net*
- *Send your response by post to: Allison Leigh, Clerk to East Hagbourne Parish Council, 26 Eaton Road, Eaton Village, Oxfordshire OX13 5PR.*

The Steering Group will publish a summary of comments once the consultation has closed. Comments received will help refine The Plan before it moves forward to the next stage.

Can I discuss it with the Steering Group?

If you want to find out more come along to an informal drop-in session where the Steering Group can answer your questions. A copy of the plan will be available to consult and comment forms which you can fill in at the time or later.

- *SATURDAY 10th MARCH, 11am-2pm, EAST HAGBOURNE PAVILION*

Why should I comment ?

This is your plan that will influence the future of your village. This consultation is your chance to comment before the plan is formally submitted to South Oxfordshire District Council.

Many thanks,

The East Hagbourne Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

Public Notice Sent to National and Public Bodies

Dear xxxxxxxxxxxx,

This notice is sent to you as a representative of xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

If you are not the most appropriate person please forward this email to whichever person in your organisation should deal with it.

PUBLIC NOTICE

EAST HAGBOURNE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION

As part of the requirements of the Localism Act 2011 and Regulation 14 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012, East Hagbourne Parish Council is undertaking pre-submission consultation on the East Hagbourne Neighbourhood Development Plan. We are hereby seeking your views on the Draft Plan.

The plan and supporting documents can be viewed online at <http://www.easthagbourneplan.net/documents>

There is a printed copy in St Andrew's Church, East Hagbourne.

The pre-submission consultation commences on 1st March 2018 and the closing date for representations is midnight on 14th April 2018.

Representations can be made in one of three ways:

Complete the online questionnaire at: <http://www.easthagbourneplan.net>

Send by email to: consultation@easthagbourneplan.net

Send by post to: Allison Leigh, Parish Clerk, 26 Eaton Road, Eaton Village, Oxfordshire OX13 5PR