

BURCOT & CLIFTON HAMPDEN NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

CONSULTATION STATEMENT

Submission Version

Prepared by Burcot and Clifton Hampden Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

December 2022

Contents

Paragraph Number	Title	Page
	List of References	
1	Overview	
2	Early Work (2014-2018)	
3	Initial (Informal) Parish Consultation (2020-2021)	
4	Pre-application Advice (2021)	
5	Regulation 21 (Pre-Submission) Consultation (2022)	
Appendix 1	Initial Parish Consultation Feedback Report	
Appendix 2	List of Statutory Consultees	
Appendix 3	Responses from Statutory Consultees to the Regulation 14 Consultation	
Appendix 4	Analysis of Responses from Members of the Public	

List of References:

A: 2014 Survey Results [Burcot-and-Clifton-Hampden-Village-Plan-Survey-Topline-Results-Version-2-NR-included.pdf](https://cliftonhampden.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2014/07/Burcot-and-Clifton-Hampden-Village-Plan-Survey-Topline-Results-Version-2-NR-included.pdf) (cliftonhampden.org.uk)

B: 2018 Survey Results <https://cliftonhampden.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/07/Neighbourhood-Plan-Follow-Up-Survey-Results-2018.pdf>

C: 2018 Consultation Event Report: [2018-Consultation-Sheet-Drop-In-Events-with-analysis.pdf](https://cliftonhampden.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/2018-Consultation-Sheet-Drop-In-Events-with-analysis.pdf) (cliftonhampden.org.uk)

D: Initial Parish Consultation (2020-2021) Feedback Report [Consultation-Feedback-Full-Report-26-May-2021.pdf](https://cliftonhampden.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/Consultation-Feedback-Full-Report-26-May-2021.pdf) (cliftonhampden.org.uk)

E: Pre-Submission (Regulation 14) draft of the Neighbourhood Plan (2022): [Documents – Neighbourhood Plan | Burcot and Clifton Hampden](https://cliftonhampden.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2022/01/Documents-Neighbourhood-Plan-Burcot-and-Clifton-Hampden.pdf)

1. Overview

This Consultation Statement has been prepared to fulfil the legal obligations of the Neighbourhood Plan Regulations 2012. Section 15(2), part 5 of the Regulations sets out what a Consultation Statement should contain:

- Contains details of the persons and bodies who were consulted about the proposed neighbourhood development order;
- Explains how they were consulted;
- Summarises the main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted;
- Describes how these issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the proposed neighbourhood development order.

2. Early work (2012-2018)

In October 2012, about 130 residents attended a Community Led Planning workshop in the village hall. The outcome was a list of the main issues that residents wanted to address, and agreement to develop a community led plan. A committee was formed.

In 2014 a detailed survey was carried out. Survey forms were hand delivered to each residential property, and follow up visits made to collect completed forms. 266 residents (out of 650) responded, and the results were reported in the Village Plan published in 2015. The survey told us that residents felt we must: safeguard the amenities, i.e. the surgery, school, shop/post office, village hall; increase housing stock; have better cycle paths and footpaths; have better parking arrangements; improve community safety; enhance our environment. As a consequence, the Parish Council decided to develop a Neighbourhood Plan, which was announced at the Annual Village Meeting in 2017. The full survey results can be found at Reference A.

In November 2018, a further consultation was carried out in order to bring some precision to the understanding of residents' needs to be brought forward through an NDO. This comprised a short survey to confirm or otherwise the main findings of the 2014 survey, and a drop in event in the Village Hall. The consultation was advertised by flyers hand delivered to every residence, by village email, and by notice boards. Survey forms were hand delivered to all residences, and an option to complete the survey on line was also provided. 213 residents responded. The survey confirmed that there was still overwhelming support for the preservation of amenities, and addressing housing needs. The survey results can be found at Reference B.

The drop-in event was attended by 50 households representing 83 residents. There was strong support for a new surgery, 90%+ for the principle of more housing. Preferences were widely expressed for smaller properties, affordable for young people and/ or for downsizing from larger properties. And that they should be for local residents and keyworkers.

Opinions on the choices for a community centre - combine village hall, scouts and sports club into one big community centre, or not – were divided and inconclusive. The NP Steering Group subsequently consulted the 3 main committees concerned (village hall; scouts, sports club). Their commonly held view was that a shared community centre would not be practical to manage for two reasons. Firstly, each group risked a loss of identity, which is what motivated many committee members to engage, and secondly large community halls often require professional management. On this basis, the idea of a single community centre was dropped.

The consultation report can be found at Reference C.

At the drop in event, residents supported the creation of a Community Land Trust. This was subsequently registered on 24 November 2018.

3. Initial (Informal) Parish Consultation (2020-2021)

Between November 2020 and March 2021, an informal parish consultation was carried out on a draft NP, alongside the first draft of development proposals to be brought forward under an NDO. The consultation was advertised in the parish magazine, village email, notice boards, parish council website, and flyers posted to every business and residential address in the parish. The website included an on-line portal for residents to respond. Residents could also respond on paper copy forms, and by email.

Feedback from the consultation was published on the village website in May 2021. The full report can be found at Reference D and at Appendix 1: The main points are summarised here:

A total of 123 responses were received representing 230 residents. Support for the first draft of the NP and its policies was very strong amongst those who responded.

Support for retaining a GP surgery within the parish on a new site was overwhelming. Those agreeing that a new surgery is needed outnumbered those who don't agree by a ratio of more than 7:1. There was also strong support for the draft policies for the Allotments, Cemetery, improving the Village Hall, and draft policies to improve or extend the School. Some specific comments were received and where appropriate reflected in this draft.

Those expressing concerns generally did so on the basis that they did not support development proposals being consulted upon in parallel, or that there was insufficient information upon which to express an opinion.

SODC also commented on the draft NP. In their opinion, policies included in this first draft for the new surgery and new housing should not be included in a Neighbourhood Plan for a parish in the Green Belt, and that the cases for these need to be made through the NDO. These draft policies were therefore deleted.

4. Pre-Submission Consultation (Regulation 21) (2022)

5.1 The consultation method. Between 17 August 2022 and 29 September 2022, the first statutory consultation (Regulation 14) was carried out on pre-submission draft of the NP. A copy of the pre-submission draft (Reference E) which can be found here [Documents – Neighbourhood Plan | Burcot and Clifton Hampden](#). The consultation was managed by the Parish Council, announced and advertised by village email, notice boards, parish council website, and flyers posted to every business and residential address in the parish. Statutory consultees, listed at Appendix 2, received a copy directly by email. An on-line portal for residents to respond. Residents could also respond on paper copy forms, and by email. A dedicated consultation phone number was provided.

5.2 Response Overview. Comments were received from 5 statutory consultees and 16 members of the public. In their responses, 2 members of the public supported the draft NP, and 14 expressed concerns.

All comments are available for viewing on the Parish Council Website at [Neighbourhood Plan Comments – Neighbourhood Plan | Burcot and Clifton Hampden](#).

5.3 Comments from Statutory Consultees. Responses from statutory consultees are summarised in the table below:

Consultee	Summary of Comments	Parish Council Response
South Oxfordshire District Council	<p>SODC made a comprehensive set of comments and recommendations for improvement covering almost every aspect of the pre-submission plan.</p> <p>Whilst most comments are suggested improvements to wording, there are specific recommendations for policies to address climate change</p>	<p>The PC/Steering Group have accepted every recommendation, and the submission version of the NP reflects these recommendations.</p> <p>Two new policies have been added:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -BCH7 Footpaths and Cyclepaths -BCH 8 Provision of well-designed energy efficient buildings and places;.
Oxfordshire County Council	<p>OCC:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -commented on the confusion around BCH 5 which variously describes Assets of Community Value, and Local Heritage Assets. -recommended the inclusion of a map showing the areas referred to in the Green Infrastructure map -that a policy requiring developers to ensure full fibre broadband 	<p>The PC/Steering Group have accepted every recommendation, and the submission version of the NP reflects these recommendations.</p> <p>The recommendation regarding full fibre broadband is addressed in BCH8 Provision of well-</p>

	<p>connections are provided to new residential/business premises</p> <p>-welcomed support for BCH 1 policies to improve and expand school facilities</p> <p>- Recommend that the NP includes a specific policy on the historic environment that would serve to achieve the goal of conserving and enhancing the historic environment as set out in, and to accord with, the NPPF.</p>	<p>designed energy efficient buildings and places</p> <p>A new policy has been added</p> <p>-BCH6 The Local Heritage Assets. On advice from SODC, this does not include non-designated heritage assets as none have been identified or listed.</p>
Historic England	<p>Historic England commented on the confusion around BCH 5 which variously describes Assets of Community Value, and Local Heritage Assets, and recommended that the NP refer to non-designated heritage assets.</p> <p>Historic England recommended the inclusion of a policy relating to the future management of the Historic Environment</p> <p>Historic England also noted there was no reference to a Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan, or the need for one.</p> <p>-</p>	<p>BCH 5 has been replaced by a new policy Protecting Community Facilities.</p> <p>The NP area includes a conservation area, numerous listed buildings and a scheduled ancient monument. No additional candidates for non-designated heritage assets have been proposed or identified.</p> <p>A new policy has been added BCH6 Local Heritage Assets. On advice from SODC, this does not include non-designated heritage assets as none have been identified or listed.</p> <p>The Parish Council will consider at a future date the need for a Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan.</p>
National Highways	Offered no comments.	
Thames Water	<p>Thames Water recommended that the NP include:</p> <p>- for new developments, a general policy for the management of water and waste water</p> <p>-for new developments, a policy detailing water capacity limits</p> <p>-a policy regarding flood risk.</p>	<p>The PC/Steering group view is that these recommendations are generic to all development proposals within the Thames Water catchment, not specific to the NP area.</p> <p>Therefore these detailed technical matters should be addressed by developers during the planning application or building control stages of a project,</p>

		not the NP. Thames Water are statutory consultees.

Copies of the comments made by Statutory Consultees are at Appendix 3.

5.4 Comments from Members of the Public. Comments on the scheme from members of the public fell into 12 themes. Representative examples of comments made by members of the public in each of these themes, and the Parish Council/Steering Group's detailed responses are set out in Appendix 4, and summarised in paragraph 5.5 below.

Of note is that many if not most comments made by residents were not relevant to the pre-submission draft of Neighbourhood Plan, but relevant to the Neighbourhood Development Order which was put out for consultation under Regulation 21 in parallel. Comments that were not relevant to the NP have not been considered further in this consultation statement, but context explaining why they are not relevant has been provided. The Steering Group noted that all comments regarding the NDO are also reflected in one form or another in comments made in the NDO consultation, and have ensured that they are addressed through the NDO Consultation Statement, i.e., that they have not been 'lost'.

All original comments made by members of the public are available for viewing on the Parish Council Website at [Neighbourhood Plan Comments – Neighbourhood Plan | Burcot and Clifton Hampden](#)

5.5 Themes: Overview of Comments and Responses.

Policy Numbers refer to the pre-submission (Regulation 14) version.

5.7.1 BCH 1 The School. One resident argues that the school should not be allowed to grow. As this policy has now been removed from the NP, no further response is required.

5.7.2 BCH 4 Design Principles in Clifton Hampden. One resident argued that the NP should ensure that the policy address the landscape setting of listed buildings. This is covered in NPPF Paragraphs 194 – 208 and SODC Local Plan Policy ENV 7. The Steering Group felt that no further amendments to the NP are required. The same resident argued that there should be a policy addressing 'green construction practices'. The Steering Group agree and a new policy BCH8 Provision of well-designed energy efficient buildings and places.

5.7.3 BCH 5 Assets of Community Value. 3 residents commented that the list of Assets of Community Value was not sufficiently comprehensive. Following advice from SODC, we now understand that the process for designating ACVs sits outside the NP process. This policy has therefore been removed in the Submission version, and a new policy 'BCH 5 Protecting Community Facilities' included.

5.7.4 Reducing Carbon Footprint. 3 residents commented that the NP should contain policies designed to minimise the carbon footprint of new development. The Steering Group agree and a new policy BCH8 Provision of well-designed energy efficient buildings and places.

5.7.5 Footpaths and Cyclepaths. 2 residents raised concerns that the NP does not promote much needed improvement of existing footpaths and cycle paths. 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 on the Oxford Road, and a new policy, BCH7 Footpaths and Cyclepaths, has been added to the NP supporting such improvements. Of note also is that whilst the NP cannot make site allocations or safeguard land for new cycle paths or footpaths, the NDO being consulted 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.

5.7.6 Membership of the Parish Council. 1 resident commented that Burcot was not represented on the Parish Council. Membership of the Parish Council is not a planning matter, and comments on this subject are not relevant to the NP.

5.7.7. The Consultation Process. 2 residents commented that the consultation process was inadequate. Every resident within the Parish has had multiple opportunities to engage with the process, as outlined in sections 2,3 and 4 above.

5.7.8. Comments relating to the NDO. Residents made a number of comments relating to the NDO being consulted upon in parallel. Other to ensure that each comment has also been raised and responded to in the NDO consultation, which they have, no further action has been taken in respect of the NP.

5.7.9. The Surgery. The NP does not contain any policies relating to the Surgery, these having been removed following the Initial Parish Consultation on advice from SODC. No further response is therefore required.

5.7.10. Traffic and Road Safety. 4 residents raised comments relating to traffic and road safety. The NP does not contain policies that promote growth of traffic or impact road safety. 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. The PC/SG therefore consider that no further response is required.

5.7.11. Parking. 1 resident commented that more parking is required. As the parish is within the Green Belt, an NP cannot be used to make site allocations for additional parking. However, by way of context, the NDO being developed in parallel includes provision of additional public parking spaces. The PC/SG therefore consider that no further response is required.

5.7.12. Burcot Needs. 2 residents commented that the NP does not do enough for Burcot. Every resident within the Parish, including those resident in Burcot, has had multiple opportunities to engage with the process, as outlined in sections 2,3 and 4

above. Of note is that at no point since consultation began in 2014 has a specific policy proposal for new amenities or improvements to amenities in Burcot been suggested. The PC/SG therefore consider that no further response is required.

Appendix 1 - Initial Parish Consultation – Feedback Report

Published by the Neighbourhood Development Order Steering Group

26 May 2021

PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to provide you with feedback on what you told us in the Initial Parish Consultation, to explain how we are responding to what you have told us with new proposals, and to confirm the next steps of the process.

ABOUT THE CONSULTATION

The consultation was carried out in two stages between 19 November 2020 and 28 March 2021. Residents were invited to comment on the draft of the Neighbourhood Plan and a set of development proposals.

Neighbourhood Plan Policies	Development Proposals
BCH1 – New Surgery	The New Housing
BCH3 – School Improvements	The New Surgery
BCH4 – Community Facilities	The Allotments and Cemetery
BCH5 – Design Principles in Burcot	The Village Hall
BCH6 – Design Principles in Clifton Hampden	
BCH7 – Assets of Community Value	
BCH8 – Green Infrastructure	
BCH9 – Local Landscape Character	
Implementation	
Other Policies and Issues	

WHAT YOU TOLD US

Summary Statistics

A total of 123 responses were received representing 230 residents, up from 93 responses representing 176 residents at the end of the first phase of the consultation in December 2020.

75% (172) of those represented were from Clifton Hampden, 25% (58) from Burcot.

Across the parish:

- 59% (136) of those represented support or strongly support the proposals,
- 33% (77) are against or strongly against
- 8% (17) are neutral.

And Clifton Hampden and Burcot separately:

Clifton Hampden			Burcot		
Support or Strongly Support	Neutral	Against or Strongly Against	Support or Strongly Support	Neutral	Against or Strongly Against
53% (92)	8% (13)	39% (67)	76% (44)	7% (4)	17% (10)

Reason for Scoring

From your responses, it was possible to deduce the *main* reason for the scoring that you gave.

Top 3 reason given by those supporting	% of those represented	Top 3 reasons given by those against	% of those represented
Well designed scheme	29% (67)	Impact on Green Belt	13% (31)
Sustains the amenities	14% (33)	More Information Needed	5% (11)
The parish must grow	10% (22)	Process and governance	5% (12)

The Surgery

Support for retaining a GP surgery within the parish on a new site is overwhelming. 74% (172) agree that a new surgery is needed, 10% (24) disagree, 15% (34) did not express a view or needed more information. The number of residents who agree that a new surgery is needed outnumbers those who don't agree by a ratio of more than 7:1.

Of note was that many of those who are against the proposals overall and most of those who were neutral none the less agreed that a new surgery is needed.

Housing

Support for new housing within the parish is strong. 70% (161) agree that new housing is needed, 16% (37) oppose new housing, and 14% (32) did not express a view, were unsure, or needed more information. The number of residents agreeing that new housing is required outnumbered those who disagree by a ratio of more than 4:1.

Of note firstly was that some of those who are against the proposals overall and most of those who were neutral none the less agreed that some housing is needed. And secondly that the percentage of those who oppose new housing (14%) has remained substantially unchanged from levels reported in the 2014 survey, when 16% expressed the view that no new homes were needed.

Most comments made by respondents were about housing.

- **Housing Numbers and Types.** Some residents felt that the number of houses proposed was too high. Many commented on the proposed mix of housing types:
 - There should be proportionately more 1,2,& 3 bedroom houses.
 - The need for accommodation on a single floor such as single floor apartments or bungalows for elderly residents is not being met.
 - The number of Affordable Homes (e.g. shared ownership or social housing for rent) is too high

- **The Allotments Site.** Many residents whether supportive, neutral or opposed expressed concerns about the proposals for the Allotments site, e.g.:
 - Too close to Watery Lane properties
 - Should not have been extended into the field north of the current allotments
 - Risk of being overlooked
 - Loss of views onto open countryside
 - Loss of quiet enjoyment
 - Loss of rural feel of Watery Lane
 - Risk of flooding
 - Traffic concerns at the road access point shared with the village hall, surgery, new parking.
 - Whether the proposed 'Kiss and Drop' arrangements were workable in practice.

A number of residents offered ideas to improve the layout on the Allotments site. A common theme was increasing the separation between new and existing houses.

- **The Paddock Site.** Many residents were supportive of the layout, look and feel of the scheme on the Paddock site. A few expressed concerns such as proximity; risk of being overlooked; loss of views; flooding; access off the A415.
- **Housing Style.** There were mixed views on housing style. Some felt the designs shown were too modern, others not modern enough. Some expressed the view that the houses on the Allotments site should be styled individually, reflecting the character of the existing houses in Watery Lane.

The Allotments and the Cemetery. 46% (106) support the proposals to retain the allotments and provide new cemetery space. 11% (25) oppose. 43% (99) did not express a view or required more information. The number of residents supporting the proposals to retain the allotments and provide new cemetery space outnumbered those against by a ratio of more than 4:1.

The Village Hall. 51% (117) support the proposals to upgrade the village hall. 11% (25) oppose. 38% (88) did not express a view or required more information. The number of residents supporting the proposals to upgrade the village hall outnumbered those against by a ratio of more than 4:1.

The School. 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.

Environmental Issues. A number of residents expressed views on environmental issues. Their comments were generally made across the draft policies for Green Infrastructure (BCH 8) and Local Landscape Character (BCH 9), and the proposals for new housing. Of those who commented on with BCH 8 and BCH 9, about 65% (78) agreed, 26% (31) disagreed and 8% (10) required more information. Those who disagreed appeared from the text of their responses to be concerned not with the policies themselves, but that the development proposals were not compliant with them. Our reading of this is that the policies themselves are widely supported.

Reasons given by residents for commenting that the proposals were not compliant included:

- Significant harm to the Green Belt with no very special circumstances to justify
- Designs must be more eco-friendly
- Concern on the impact of the proposals on bio-diversity

Parking. Many residents expressed concerns about whether the scheme delivered enough new parking.

The New Loo. Views on the proposed loo were sharply divided. Some see it as essential, whilst others were strongly opposed.

Clifton Hampden as a Visitor Attraction. A number of residents expressed the view that, based on the experience of Summer 2020, Clifton Hampden is already a visitor attraction causing significant additional pressures on parking, and that no further steps should be taken through the scheme to pursue such an objective.

Footpath and Cyclepath links between Burcot and Clifton Hampden. A few residents expressed the view that the scheme should aim to improve the link between Burcot and Clifton Hampden for pedestrians and cyclists, away from the A415.

Future Development.

- A number of residents expressed concerns that these proposals could set a precedent for further development on the two sites and more widely, and that it should be an explicit objective of the scheme and its legal framework to include safeguards against this.
- A number of residents expressed the view that the proposals do not do enough to safeguard against infill development in Burcot.
- A few residents expressed the view that the proposals don't offer enough for residents of Burcot, and that some development in Burcot should be considered.

Implementation

35% (82) agreed with the proposed implementation plans. 7% (15) disagreed. 64% (148) did not express a view or required more information. The number of residents agreeing the proposals for implementation outnumbered those who disagreed by a ratio of more than 5:1.

The consultation itself. The quality and volume of the feedback received is evidence that residents, whether for, neutral or against, have taken a great deal of care in preparing their responses using the information available and contributing to a data set that is rich in detail. A number of residents expressed concerns with the consultation process, and the lack of information to form a view on some aspects.

Governance. A number of residents expressed concerns about the governance of the project. These have been addressed separately by the Parish Council.

WHAT WE ARE DOING ABOUT IT

The Revised Scheme

The Steering Group are now developing a revised scheme:

- A significant downward shift in the size of houses towards 1, 2 and 3 bedrooms, with most available as market housing.
- To include single floor accommodation arranged in bungalows and apartments.
- A major redesign of the Allotments reflecting the smaller footprint required and reducing the impact on neighbouring properties.
- A reconfiguration of the Paddock site to reduce the impact on neighbouring properties, particularly the risk of being overlooked.

The following features of the current proposals will be retained:

- Use of both sites, with the Surgery, smaller housing, additional parking, Allotments and Cemetery on the Allotments Site, and larger houses on the Paddock Site.

- Some Affordable Housing (but a lower number than the 10 currently proposed).
- Village Hall Improvements

The following feature remains under consideration:

- The new loo

We are also considering, as part of options for the scheme and related settlement with the landowner, and in order to address concerns about future development, arrangements for the ownership of undeveloped land that might be acquired from the Gibbs Estate through this scheme, on the principle that the best way for the community to influence or prevent future development on land is to own it. Examples of this are Watery Lane and the garages by the Old School Yard, and the Village Hall car park.

WHAT HAPPENS NEXT

We will now hold a series of meetings:

- ‘Q&A’ sessions open to all residents. Each meeting will be for an hour and, in order to allow everyone present a reasonable opportunity for their questions to be aired, each meeting will be limited to 10 people. Enough meetings will be held for everyone who wishes to do so to attend one meeting.
- Once we have drafted an option or options for a revised scheme, and in accordance with the undertakings given at the workshops on 5 April 2021, we plan to hold two design workshops (one for the Paddock site, one for the Allotments site) with those residents most directly impacted, to hear their views on the option(s) for a revised layout on each site and explore what further improvements might be made. We will then invite the community as a whole to do the same through the second Parish Consultation.
- Two meetings, open to all, to discuss and to explore concerns and discuss ideas about:
 - Environmental issues such as eco-performance, biodiversity, and visual impact
 - Parking and access

These meetings will be held face to face after 21st June, Covid-19 permitting. They will be held in the Church until the Village Hall is no longer required for vaccinations, which we understand to be late July.

Please visit the ‘Workshops and Meetings’ page on the website for dates, times and how to register.

These meetings are in addition to the Annual Village Meeting to be arranged by the Parish Council.

Second Parish Consultation

We plan to hold the second, non statutory, parish consultation on the revised proposals, over 6 weeks in September/October 2021 starting with an open event in the Village Hall. That will be followed by the statutory ‘Pre-Submission’ consultation managed by SODC in early 2022, then public examination by an inspector leading up to a Referendum in mid 2022.

Additional Information Updates

Over the next few weeks, the website will be updated to include details of meetings and workshops, and updated versions of the papers already published, reflecting the outcome of the consultation and new information:

- Overview of Project and Community Engagement Timelines
- Housing Numbers and Types

- The Surgery
 - A new paper on the future ownership of Estate land
- Thank you again

Giles Baxter OBE
Chair
Neighbourhood Development Order Steering Group
gileshlbaxter@btinternet.com

Notes on the Analysis Process

Sensitivity Check

Respondents were invited to say how many residents lived at their property, and how many of these were represented in their response. The statistics in this report use the number of residents represented for quantitative analysis. However we also wanted to check whether using the number of responses for quantitative analysis would have returned a different result.

Based on the number of responses (total 123):

- 59% (72) of those represented support or strongly support the proposals,
- 33% (41) are against or strongly against
- 8% (10) are neutral.

These results are identical to the method based on the numbers of residents represented.

We also wanted to check whether the results were affected because we accepted responses from those who are resident here and those who own residential property in the parish but are not resident, and from residents of all ages. To do so we tested what the outcome of the referendum, in which those under the age of 18 and/or not resident in the parish are not eligible to vote, might be if residents voted along the same lines as their responses. Based on our collective knowledge of the parish and its residents, we estimated the number of residents represented in each response who are likely to be eligible to vote in a referendum in 2022.

We estimated:

- 159 of those represented would be eligible to vote
- 65% (103) would vote yes
- 35% (56) would vote no

For the purposes of this calculation, we assumed that the eligible residents who expressed a neutral view would not cast a vote.

We therefore concluded that the statistics for the overall level of support were not materially sensitive to the method (number represented, number responded, number eligible to vote in a referendum) used to generate them.

Code of Practice

This report has been prepared in accordance with guidance on how to release information safely as issued by the Information Commissioners' Office. Of particular note is the guidance that particular

care must be taken that the identity and views of an individual, to whom an undertaking of confidentiality has been given, cannot be inferred by a 3rd party outside the Steering Group.

Analysis Team

The analysis was conducted by the members of the Steering Group 'The Data Processor', namely the 5 community members, the landowner, and the GP surgery partners representative. The Development Partner has sight of the responses as a member of the Steering group, and in the nominated role of 'Data Controller'. The Development Partner has not been involved in the analysis of responses.

Analysis Methodology

Respondents were invited to tell us in overall terms what they thought of the draft Neighbourhood Plan and development proposals, using this scale:

Strongly Support	Support	Neutral	Against	Strongly Against
------------------	---------	---------	---------	------------------

Respondents were invited to tell us why they scored as they did, to make general comments, and to comment on each section of the development proposals and draft Neighbourhood Plan

Development Proposals	Neighbourhood Plan Policies
The New Housing	BCH1 – New Surgery
The New Surgery	BCH3 – School Improvements
The Allotments and Cemetery	BCH4 – Community Facilities
The Village Hall	BCH5 – Design Principles in Burcot
	BCH6 – Design Principles in Clifton Hampden
	BCH7 – Assets of Community Value
	BCH8 – Green Infrastructure
	BCH9 – Local Landscape Character
	Implementation
	Other Policies and Issues

Some respondents sent their comments in letters and emails using their own format. The steering group generally found it straightforward to deduce how these responses should be scored, and to assign their comments against the most relevant section from the list above.

Residents from Watery Lane and the High Street who are most directly impacted by the development proposals were invited to attend workshops on 25th March. A number of those attending submitted comments on the proposals which have been also been taken into account in the analysis of their responses and preparation of this report.

Each section of each response was then summarised and put into an analysis spreadsheet, one row per response, along with the name, location (Burcot, Clifton Hampden), the number represented in

the response, score, and an estimate of the number of those represented likely to be on the electoral roll.

Members of the Steering Group independently checked that the spreadsheet entries were a reflection of the text entries on response forms. Each member of the Steering Group also read every response form so as to come to their own view of the main themes emerging.

The combination of quantitative scoring and qualitative comments transferred into a single integrated document has provided the Steering Group with a rich data set from which to conduct both quantitative and qualitative analysis of the type reported in this document, for the scheme as a whole and for each individual element of it.

The Steering Group will not be publishing this document. This is because, in order to protect the identity of respondents and to respect the undertaking of confidentiality given, the content would have to be in large part redacted.

The Steering Group will prepare and include a thematic Consultation Statement with the Pre-Submission draft of the Neighbourhood Plan and Neighbourhood Development Order put forward for statutory consultation under Regulations 14 and 21.

Appendix 2 – List of Statutory Consultees

Oxfordshire County Council – Planning Policy
Oxfordshire County Council – Cllr Robin Bennett
South and Vale Planning – Ricardo Rios]
South Oxfordshire District Council – Planning Policy
South Oxfordshire District Council – Cllr Sam Casey-Rehaye
Long Wittenham Parish Council
Berinsfield Parish Council
Nuneham Courtney Parish Council
Culham Parish Council
Dorchester on Thames Parish Council
Coal Authority
Homes England
Natural England
Environment Agency
Historic England
Network Rail
Highways England
Marine Management Organisation
BT
EE
Three
EMF
Gigaclear
NHS (Oxnet)
NHS property
National Grid
Cadent Gas
SSE
UK Power Networks
Thames Water
UKAEA
Age UK Oxfordshire
CPRE
BBOWT

