

DRAFT FOR PC CONSIDERATION

Burcot and Clifton Hampden Parish Council

August 2023

Neighbourhood Plan Examination

1st Clarification Note - Parish Council Response

The examiner has asked for clarification in four areas.

- 1. Does the Parish Council accept the changes recommended by SODC in their response?** As before, SODC have been very pro-active in their contributions to the NP and their response here continues in that spirit. We accept their recommendations without reservation.
- 2. BCH 5.** The Examiner asked if the third part of the policy been designed to address proposals which would result in the loss of the identified facilities (by way of a proposed redevelopment or a change of use to a non-community use)?

Yes. The Parish is a small community of about 660 residents, 220 houses, with facilities and amenities that are truly remarkable for parish of its size. The objectives for the Neighbourhood Plan include “to sustain and improve local services, business and amenities”, and this policy speaks directly to this objective. The wording in the third part of this policy is as recommended by SODC in their response to the Regulation 14 consultation.

- 3. Would the PC elaborate on its approach to BCH 6 Local Heritage Assets?** The policy was included to reflect responses to the Regulation 14 consultation from Heritage England and SODC as a mechanism for giving additional protection to assets that the community feels warrant additional protection, but are not nationally designated Heritage Assets. No such buildings have been identified during any of the consultations.

Our reading of the Regulation 14 responses from HE and SODC was that such a policy would act as a ‘placeholder’, should the community at some point in the future identify assets that it would wish to have designated as Local Heritage Assets, and to go through the designation process, at which point BCH6 would come into play. We acknowledge that the Examiner may take the view that without including Local Heritage Assets that have been specifically designated, there is little point to this policy and suggest it is removed. We have therefore provided the explanation requested, and will be guided by the Examiner’s recommendation.

We also note SODC’s comments around the drafting of this policy, and the use of the word ‘designated’ to describe both nationally designated and locally designated heritage assets. In the event that the Examiner is content for the policy to be retained, we would welcome a recommendation on the appropriate terminology to be used.

- 4. Representation in response to the representations made in the Reg 16 Consultation.**

76 Responses were received. Of these 8 were from statutory consultees, and 68 from members of the public.

Statutory Consultees

Of the 8 responses from statutory consultees, 5 did not include any actionable comments.

In their response, SODC make extensive comments and recommendations, which the Parish Council accept.

The Thames Water response makes comments and recommendations regarding policy for general water and wastewater infrastructure, flood risk and sustainable drainage systems. The Parish Council response is that the matters raised by Thames Water are already addressed through NPPF, through engagement with developers via the Local Planning Authority, and with the use of planning conditions, as explained in their response. The requested changes are not specific to our Neighbourhood Plan area, and there is no need for them to be repeated within the Neighbourhood Plan.

The CPRE response is an objection. The Parish Council response is that the challenges raised are relevant to the NDO rather than the NP, and should be addressed through the examination of the NDO.

Members of the Public

Of the 68 responses received, 51 were in support and 17 objections. The Parish Council notes that some responses were also relevant to the NDO, and will be considered as part of our representation on the NDO.

Members of the public highlighted a range of issues and made suggested improvements that have not been raised previously, and the Parish Council would like to take this opportunity to further revise the NP. These are set out in the table below.

Issue	Summary of Comment	Parish Council Response
Typographical	Correction of typographical, spelling and grammatical errors	Accept and Amend
Factual	The NP states there are 3 pubs in the NP area, but there are only 2. The Barley Mow is in the Long Wittenham NP Area.	Accept and Amend Close examination of the NP area map reveals this comment is correct. Our confusion has arisen because the Barley Mow lies within the Clifton Hampden Conservation Area.
Factual	Paragraph 5.1 Contrary to the statement, only two of the amenities have been gifted by the Gibbs family to the village.	Accept and amend by removing the statement about gifting.
Policy	The NP has been written to support the NDO and promotes development..	This challenge was raised in the Regulation 14 consultation and addressed in the Consultation Statement, which explained that earlier draft policies that promote development of housing and the surgery, included in previous drafts, had been removed. Removal of these policies should not be taken as acceptance that the

Issue	Summary of Comment	Parish Council Response
		<p>community does not support development. As set out in the Consultation Statement, an overwhelming majority of residents support the development of a new surgery, and a significant majority the provision of new housing, which are being brought forward via the NDO submitted in parallel.</p> <p>The NDO is self supporting. Whilst the NDO was initiated as a result of the earlier stages of consultation on the NP, the evidence supporting the NDO is contained entirely within the NDO submission. The NDO is not dependent on NP policies for support or the promotion of development.</p> <p>However the Parish Council accepts that the first bullet of Para 8.4 is in part a legacy from the early development of the NP which did promote development in accordance with residents expressed wishes. We propose to modify the bullet to remove reference to the surgery and new homes. The remaining projects were identified as parish needs through the various NP consultations, and will be retained.</p>
Policy	The NP should include a Design Code, as has been included in both the Culham and Sutton Courtney NPs..	<p>Whilst the NP does not include a design code, it does include design principles in BCH3 and BCH4, both of which have been described by the Examiner as 'good policies'. The Parish Council will also amend the supporting text for NP Policies BCH3 and BCH4 to refer to SODC's new design code, as recommended by SODC.</p> <p>The context for Culham and Sutton Courtney is very different from Clifton Hampden. The Culham NP area includes the strategic allocation (STRAT 9) Land adjacent to Culham Science Centre Sutton Courtney is outside the Green Belt, has experienced very significant growth over the last 100 years, and may be</p>

Issue	Summary of Comment	Parish Council Response
		<p>further impacted by Didcot Garden own and ribbon development along the A415. In both cases, these villages are exposed to developer/landowner led development, and there is a need for a comprehensive design code. Our NP area, in contrast, is protected as washed over Green Belt and as such, any development other than Infill must be community led and decided through referendum.</p> <p>The Parish Council View therefore is that Policies BCH3 and BCH4 and the SODC Design Code are sufficient, and the considerable effort and expense that would be required to prepare a full Design Code specific to this NP is not warranted.</p>
Policy	The NP should include a policy for Sustainable Transport.	<p>Whilst a number of respondents comment that the NP should have a Sustainable Transport policy, no indication of what provisions such a policy should address. The NP includes a policy BCH7 Footpaths and Cyclepaths. This policy was included in the Submission version of the NP in response to comments received in the Regulation 14 consultation, and is, in effect, the policy for sustainable transport within the NP. In drafting the policy, we used the Long Wittenham NP policy LW7 Footpaths and Cycle paths as a model.</p>

Other comments made by members of the public are restatements of comments made in the Regulation 14 Response. The Parish Council addressed these in the Consultation Statement and believe that a further response is not required.