

**Burcot and Clifton Hampden Neighbourhood Plan Submission Version
Consultation Statement**

**Appendix 4: ANALYSIS OF COMMENTS MADE BY MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC IN THE PRE-SUBMISSION (REGULATION 14)
CONSULTATION AND THE PARISH COUNCIL/STEERING GROUP RESPONSE**

Theme (no of responders mentioning this theme)	Illustrative Comments	Parish Council/Steering Group Response
Comments of Support (2)	<p>We should like to record our support for the draft Neighbourhood Plan, and the associated NDO. We look forward to the completion of this now rather long-drawn out process.</p> <p>Thank you for the considerable work that has gone into these plans and for the updates provided, which I fully support.</p>	<p>The PC/SG therefore consider that no modifications to the NP are needed as a result of the comments made under this theme.</p>
BCH 1: The School (1)	<p>The Clifton Hampden school is already beyond capacity and should not be allowed to expand further. The playground is prominent in the village and is looking overused. Further pupils would mean more traffic and parking problems as children are brought from surrounding villages. More importantly, the school would lose its village school character. A small rural school makes up for lack of diversity of educational experiences by its family atmosphere. Children and their families are well known to the teachers, the school is connected to our community and church: expansion would threaten these important linkages.</p>	<p>In the Initial Parish Consultation (2019), 38% (88) agreed with the draft Neighbourhood Plan policies to improve or extend the school. 7% (16) disagreed. 55% (126) did not express a view, were unsure, or required more information. The number of residents agreeing the policies for the school outnumbered those who did not by a ratio of more than 5:1.</p> <p>The PC/SG therefore consider that no modifications to the NP are needed as a result of the comments made under this theme.</p>

Theme (no of responders mentioning this theme)	Illustrative Comments	Parish Council/Steering Group Response
BCH 4: Design Principles in Clifton Hampden (1)	<p>There is no mention in BCH4 Design principles about the landscape that frames the setting of the listed buildings in the community. I think it is also important to mention design elements that fit future living, such as green construction practices; after all this document will stand until 2034. We need to think about future design and use of space, not just focus on current needs.</p>	<p>Planning policy concerning heritage assets (including listed buildings) and their setting is contained in the NPPF (Paragraphs 194 to 208) and the SODC Local Plan 2035 (Policy ENV 7).</p> <p>The PC/SG therefore consider that no modifications to the NP are needed as a result of this comment.</p> <p>The PC/SG agree that the NP should address green construction practices, which we interpret to mean design features to reduce carbon footprint. These are addressed in the new policy -BCH8 Provision of well-designed energy efficient buildings and places</p>
BCH 5: Assets of Community Value (3)	<p>Misses a lot of Amenities, especially in Burcot. Petrol Station, Garage, Forge, The Close and John Masefield Care Homes, various at Burcot farm.</p> <p>There are amenities not listed in the NP such as the petrol station, the garage, the Forge and besides the Chequers in Burcot, I assume there are other amenities in Burcot that could be listed? If there are not any other amenities in Burcot then why not? Let's not forget this is a parish of two villages and one of them seems to have been mostly forgotten. More thoughts on Burcot should be added.</p>	<p>On advice from SODC, an Asset of Community Value policy would only apply to buildings nominated as ACV's by SODC. Furthermore, ACVs are only temporary designations, for 5 years. The process for designating ACVs sits outside the NP process.</p> <p>This policy has therefore been removed in the Submission version, and a new policy 'BCH 5 Protecting Community Facilities' included.</p>

Theme (no of responders mentioning this theme)	Illustrative Comments	Parish Council/Steering Group Response
		The policy includes a list of community facilities.
The Surgery (1)	<p>The Clifton Hampden Surgery Pharmacy is not available to Burcot Residents due to a ridiculous rule (Pharmacy Access Scheme) to benefit the Berensfield Pharmacy. This despite the fact that the CH Surgery is within reasonable and safer walking distance for Burcot residents, while the Berensfield pharmacy is further away and includes crossing a major road. With no public transport available, at all, in Burcot, this places a great burden on people who cannot drive and are therefore discriminated against. This scheme should be challenged.</p> <p>The proposed new surgery. With Dr.James retiring, what commitment has the surgery provided? What is the legal position? Having a modern, imposing surgery in the centre of the village will cause parking and traffic chaos (with no public transport options for many surgery attendees). Surely a better alternative would be by the H roundabout or Golden Balls (perhaps sharing a new facility with Berinsfield) – with adequate public transport/parking for the majority of patients attending from outside of Clifton Hampden.</p>	<p>On advice from SODC, the draft policy on the Surgery that was included in the Initial Parish Consultation has now been removed.</p> <p>These comments are not relevant to the NP.</p> <p>The PC/SG therefore consider that no modifications to the NP are needed as a result of the comments made under this theme.</p>
Housing (4)	<p>I object to this development due to the large numbers of affordable housing built in the surrounding area. This is not an affordable housing scheme from the designs shown but is a vehicle for financial gain</p> <p>The charge that this Neighbourhood Plan reflects what people asked for is just not true. There have been significant errors in the analysis of the housing needs, which I cover in my NDO response. What the village actually wanted, was small developments, smaller houses and very little desire for 5-</p>	<p>On advice from SODC, the draft policy on New Housing that was included in the Initial Parish Consultation has now been removed, as the NP cannot make a site allocation in the Green Belt.</p> <p>These comments are not relevant to the NP.</p> <p>The PC/SG therefore consider that no modifications to the NP are needed as a result of the comments made under this theme</p>

Theme (no of responders mentioning this theme)	Illustrative Comments	Parish Council/Steering Group Response
	<p>bedroom houses. We don't need any more large houses! Originally what was talked about was housing for the elderly (downsize) and cheaper housing for our children as first-time buyers. This NP should be abandoned, it is predominantly a housing development scheme that dominates and divides the community and will forever diminish our valuable green spaces.</p> <p>Lucky to get away with 17 new houses</p>	
Traffic and Road Safety (4)	<p>....weeding the front of the house is terrifying because of the volume and speed of the traffic. I can't sit in my back garden the noise means that you have to shout to be heard. There is a queue of cars morning and evening for at least 1 hour and I am treated in my kitchen to whatever music the drivers like to play at full blast.</p> <p>There are key issues within the village which the Neighbourhood Plan does not adequately address or attempt to mitigate against, namely traffic, road safety and parking. The proposal for new houses, an expanded surgery (with a doubling of patient numbers), school expansion (more pupils), would all add to the traffic flow, create more congestion, more noise, higher air pollution levels, and greater numbers of frustrated and reckless drivers in the village. The traffic at peak times on the Oxford Road and Abingdon Road is already at very high levels, and we cannot support a Plan which adds to these levels. The Planning Application for the proposed new Clifton Hampden Bypass has not yet been approved, so we do not know if it will go ahead, and the congestion is yet to be diverted elsewhere. Conversely during off-peak times, the 30 MPH limits on both the Oxford Road and Abingdon Road are disregarded by many drivers racing through the village. When so many of the villages around have 20 MPH designated zones and/or traffic calming measures (e.g. Long Wittenham) could Clifton Hampden,</p>	<p>The traffic and road safety issues here are not matters that can be addressed through the NP. The NP does not contain policies that promote growth of traffic or impact road safety.</p> <p>Development proposals, including the NDO, that may impact on traffic and road safety must address potential concerns via the normal planning application process for which Oxfordshire County Council is a statutory consultee.</p> <p>Parking is addressed under the 'Parking' Theme.</p> <p>The PC/SG therefore consider that no modifications to the NP are needed as a result of the comments made under this theme</p>

Theme (no of responders mentioning this theme)	Illustrative Comments	Parish Council/Steering Group Response
	<p>which clearly has a need for it, also demand these measures? The Plan highlights new footpaths as a benefit around Site A and Site B, and yet crossing the Abingdon Road at that point (where the current footpath is) can be very dangerous with speeding cars coming through a blind drop in the road from the Abingdon direction. Nothing in the Plan mitigates against this increased risk as more people from the new housing developments would be expected to use this footpath. Without a movement of the village boundary and relocation of the 30 MPH sign further out of the village to try to slow drivers before the blind drop, the dangers to pedestrians are exacerbated. The two new housing development entrances also pose a high accident risk if the village boundary and speed limit are not moved further out in an attempt to slow drivers down. Finally, parking in the village is often difficult so a Plan which increases the number of visitors to a surgery as well as the number of visitors to a growing village needs to have substantial additional provision of parking within it</p> <p>The traffic on the A415 continues to cause problems despite the supposed 30mph speed limit. The Speed warning light has not been working for years. More calming is needed.</p>	
<p>Parking (1)</p>	<p>More parking spaces in Clifton Hampden are required for access to the school and other assets</p>	<p>As the parish is within the Green Belt, an NP cannot be used to make site allocations for additional parking.</p> <p>By way of context, the NDO being developed in parallel includes provision of additional public parking spaces on what is known as the Allotment Site in the centre of Clifton Hampden village, and a new ‘grass crete’ car park on the southern site known as the Paddock Site.</p>

Theme (no of responders mentioning this theme)	Illustrative Comments	Parish Council/Steering Group Response
		<p>The PC/SG therefore consider that no modifications to the NP are needed as a result of the comments made under this theme</p>
Environmental Factors (1)	<p>Policies do not include anything on Environmental factors covering Cycle Paths, Bike Racks, EV Charging, Solar panels, Wilding etc. Whereas we may be restricted by the need to take National and Local Policies into account and by the limitation on powers available to an NDP, there should still be a substantial recognition of Environmental Issues within the NDP document in some form.</p>	<p>In response to this comment, and reflecting emergent government policy, the NP contains a new policy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - BCH8 Provision of well-designed energy efficient buildings and places <p>The Environment Act 2021 requires developers to demonstrate (as part of the planning process) that they will deliver a minimum 10% net gain of biodiversity units for 'area-based' habitats and any relevant linear habitats, such as hedgerows, lines of trees, and watercourses.</p> <p>BCH9 Green Environment includes a clause requiring a 10% net biodiversity gain.</p>
Cyclepaths and Footpaths (2)	<p>The footpath on the North side of A415 serves also as a cycle route, although poor maintenance results in overhanging branches and shards of glass and other debris on the path itself. Many cyclists prefer to cycle on the main road. The path needs upgrading to make it safer for children and the needs of elderly people living in the Care Homes using mobility scooters should be considered, so that they do not need to ride on the dangerous road.</p>	<p>As the parish is within the Green Belt, an NP cannot be used to make site allocations or safeguard land for cyclepaths or footpaths.</p> <p>The PC/SG agree that there is a need for the existing footpath on the A415 between Clifton Hampden and Burcot to be improved, together with improvements to the footpaths</p>

Theme (no of responders mentioning this theme)	Illustrative Comments	Parish Council/Steering Group Response
		<p>on the Oxford Road, and a new policy, BCH7 Footpaths and Cyclepaths.</p> <p>The PC/SG agree that there is a requirement to improve safety for pedestrians crossing the bridge to the Barley Mow. However it is not practical to do so by physical alteration or re-alignment, and therefore the PC/SG believes the solution lies with moving the traffic lights and altering the phasing. This could only be considered after the construction of the new Clifton Hampden bypass, and funded from CIL contributions. This aspiration is therefore included in the list (Paragraph 8.4) of identified projects to be funded for example from Section 106 contributions.</p> <p>By way of further context, the NDO being consulted on in parallel makes provision for an extensive increase in the amount of publicly accessible space and footpaths on either side of the A415 within the conservation area, on land that will pass into community ownership.</p> <p>The PC/SG are also mindful that there is a policy in the made Long Wittenham NP (LWP 7) to support a new footpath and cyclepath between Long Wittenham and Clifton Hampden. The route does not fall within our</p>

Theme (no of responders mentioning this theme)	Illustrative Comments	Parish Council/Steering Group Response
		parish boundary and so it is not appropriate to make policy provision for it in the NP.
Comments relating to the NDO (7)	<p>The NDO proposals are embedded in the NDP, under the guise of identified projects arising from Section 106 agreements</p> <p>I oppose the NP as it is centered on the NDO proposal which involves building on Green Belt land.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the Neighbourhood Plan (NP), most of my commentary is about the NDO as the NDO dominates the NP</p>	<p>Comments relating to the NDO are not relevant for the NP.</p> <p>The PC/SG therefore consider that no modifications to the NP are needed as a result of the comments made under this theme</p>
Burcot's Needs (2)	<p>There are amenities not listed in the NP such as the petrol station, the garage, the Forge and besides the Chequers in Burcot, I assume there are other amenities in Burcot that could be listed? If there are not any other amenities in Burcot then why not? Let's not forget this is a parish of two villages and one of them seems to have been mostly forgotten. More thoughts on Burcot should be added</p> <p>Burcot has no community amenities</p>	<p>BCH 5, which lists Assets of Community Value, has been removed from the NP. In its place a new policy BCH 5 Protecting Community Facility has been included, which lists the Chequers as such.</p> <p>The new BCH 5 meets the conditions set out in NPPF Para 92 and 93, which includes examples of community facilities such as local shops, meeting places, sports venues, open space, cultural buildings, public houses and places of worship. The petrol station, garage, forge, businesses on Burcot Farm, the Close and John Masefield care homes are regarded primarily as commercial enterprises that happen to be located within the parish, rather than community facilities.</p>

Theme (no of responders mentioning this theme)	Illustrative Comments	Parish Council/Steering Group Response
		At no point since consultation began in 2014 has a specific policy proposal for new amenities in Burcot been suggested.
Consultation Process (2)	<p>I appreciate the work that has been put into this document thus far, but would it not benefit from a community engagement exercise to consider views of new residents that may have valuable contributions and ideas?</p> <p>In summary, I feel that the NDO consultation has confused residents of the Parish and that the Neighbourhood Plan can only be agreed with further consultation, after the outcome of the NDO has been decided. By their nature, they are separate.</p> <p>I was unaware that the neighbourhood plan had been updated and required a response, despite attending most Parish Council meetings over the past 12 months. This is a very confusing consultation</p>	<p>The consultation process that has been followed and the results of each stage and actions taken by the PC/SG are set out in the Statement of Community Involvement.</p> <p>Every resident within the Parish has had multiple opportunities to engage with the process, as evidenced in the Consultation Statement.</p> <p>Of note is that 75 residents of Burcot were represented in responses to the Informal Consultation held between November 2020 and March 2021, in which views were sought on the first version of the NP. Comments on draft policies from residents, including those from Burcot, were overwhelmingly positive.</p> <p>The PC/SG therefore consider that no modifications to the NP are needed as a result of the comments made under this theme</p>
Membership of the Parish Council (1)	Burcot representation on the Parish Council is needed. The Parish Council had an offer from two Burcot residents, but these were rejected!	<p>Membership of the Parish Council is not a planning matter, and comments on this subject are not relevant to the NP.</p> <p>However a number of residents have raised this at Parish Council meetings and in</p>

Theme (no of responders mentioning this theme)	Illustrative Comments	Parish Council/Steering Group Response
		<p>comments on the NP pre-submission consultation, so it is appropriate to respond.</p> <p>Residents from Burcot have been represented on the Parish Council. When this project was initiated the Deputy Chair was from Burcot and had representation until the last election (May 2019). No residents from Burcot chose to put themselves forward for election, neither did a Burcot resident chose to stand for co-option during the statutory period following the election. The Parish Council being quorate was, and remains content with its current membership.</p> <p>Following consultation of the NP and NDO scheme in 2020 a group of objector residents tried to incorrectly force an election. When that failed they asked the PC to co-opt one of their number which again was legitimately declined.</p> <p>Adding further context, the comment made by a resident in this consultation fails to mention that some objectors to the NDO had made unsubstantiated complaints regarding the conduct of both Parish Councillors and members of the Steering Group and the process used. In addition a social media campaign, often anonymous, of abuse, unsubstantiated complaints, defamatory</p>

Theme (no of responders mentioning this theme)	Illustrative Comments	Parish Council/Steering Group Response
		<p>statements, and misinformation was also directed at Parish Councillors and members of the Steering Group.</p> <p>Although no comment has been made specifically about membership of the steering groups, it is appropriate to provide clarification.</p> <p>The history of this community led project since inception in 2012 is set out in a paper (Updated December 2022) on the website</p> <p>Clifton Hampden & Burcot Parish Council » Additional Information</p> <p>Burcot has been continuously represented in the steering groups since inception in 2012. Records of the minutes of the Village Plan committee that conducted the 2014 survey are incomplete. A search of those records that do exist found that at least 5 residents of Burcot were represented in the various committees that existed from 2012 to 2017. The records also show that one Burcot resident, who has been repeatedly and publicly critical of the lack of representation of Burcot residents on the Parish Council and various committees, and the lack of any benefits specifically for Burcot, was a member of the committee in 2013 and at one meeting</p>

Theme (no of responders mentioning this theme)	Illustrative Comments	Parish Council/Steering Group Response
		<p>took an action to “consult neighbours in Burcot to see if additional amenities are required in Burcot”. There is no record of any such consultation having taken place, and despite ample opportunity there is no record at any time in the NP/NDO process from 2012 to date of any specific suggestion or policy proposals for Burcot. The individual concerned left the committee in 2014, of their own volition.</p> <p>Since the launch of the Neighbourhood Plan in 2017, work to develop a NP was managed by the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee. Membership of the SG has varied as individuals have joined and left. No application to join the NP SG was ever refused. Burcot has been well represented. Of note is the membership of the SG on 13 Mar 19 when the strategy that launched the NDO was agreed: development on the two sites, new housing, new surgery, other improvements. Of the 10 community members, 4 were residents of Burcot. Previously, a 5th resident of Burcot joined the SG for a short period.</p> <p>The PC/SG therefore consider that no modifications to the NP are needed as a result of the comments made under this theme</p>

Theme (no of responders mentioning this theme)	Illustrative Comments	Parish Council/Steering Group Response
Eco Credentials (2)	<p>What are the eco credentials of each unit? Where is the assurance that they will be fitted with solar panels, loft and wall insulation? No specifications have been provided.</p> <p>We were promised 'green' houses, but there is no indication in the present plans that they will be anything other than standard developer's houses, similar to the poorly designed housing that is going up all around us.</p>	<p>These comments are concerned with the design proposals for the NDO</p> <p>Implicit in them however is that the NP should include a policy moving toward improving the Eco-Credentials of development. This has been taken up in the new policy BCH8 Provision of well-designed energy efficient buildings and places</p>