

**Burcot and Clifton Hampden Neighbourhood Development Order Submission Version  
Consultation Statement**

**Appendix 4: ANALYSIS OF COMMENTS MADE BY MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC IN THE PRE-SUBMISSION (REGULATION 21)  
CONSULTATION AND THE PARISH COUNCIL/STEERING GROUP RESPONSE**

Theme (no of responders commenting on this theme)	Illustrative Comments	Parish Council/Steering Group Response
Green Belt (23)	<p>I strongly believe that we should not be building on our protected greenbelt land. By doing so we risk future developments elsewhere in the parish - our case to protect what's left of our green spaces could be significantly weakened if we allow this to go ahead.</p> <p>DAMAGE TO LOCAL GREEN BELT: The development will directly damage the green belt / conservation area, specifically earmarked for protection and will irreversibly change the nature and damage the character of this historic village</p> <p>Whilst the Green Belt should not be an immovable obstacle, it seeks to restrict new buildings where they are considered to be inappropriate and the very special circumstances test sets a high bar. Both sites are in the Green Belt and development as proposed would result in a loss of openness of the Green Belt land in available local views and an apparent encroachment into the countryside...</p> <p>I oppose the scheme because: 1). This scheme could set a precedent for NDOs to be used to override local planning law and Green Belt/Conservation Area protections in communities across the UK. As the SODC pre-application advice states:</p>	<p>We note that most comments referring to Green Belt and the Conservation Area do so collectively. These are sperate issues, covered by different policies within NPPF.</p> <p>Our response to this theme addresses comments on Green Belt issues. Our response to comments on Conservation Area issues is covered under the Conservation Area theme.</p> <p>Many respondents have misunderstood Green Belt policy. Whilst NPPF seeks to restrict development that comes into conflict with the purpose of the Green Belt, it also makes provision for exceptions.</p> <p>One example of such an exception is Infill as applies to recent developments in Burcot.</p>

Theme (no of responders commenting on this theme)	Illustrative Comments	Parish Council/Steering Group Response
	<p>“The proposal is a unique one in South Oxfordshire and I am not aware of a similar proposal in such a context anywhere else nationally. The site is notably within Green Belt, has a sensitive heritage setting, is adjacent to public rights of way and is largely not considered to be previously developed land....</p>	<p>The NDO is an example of another exception. Development is permitted, subject to compliance with national and local planning policies, if the NDO is passed at referendum. In this case, because the proposed NDO comes into conflict with the purposes of the Green Belt, specifically the openness test, the NDO must also pass the Very Special Circumstances test.</p> <p>Evidence that Very Special Circumstances exist is set out in the NDO itself which defines the benefits to the community, and supporting documentation, principally Counsel’s opinion, the Housing needs Analysis, Site Assessment, Surgery Evidence, Statement of Community Involvement.</p> <p>Previous consultations have demonstrated that a significant majority of the community support the NDO proposal to deliver community benefits, a new surgery and meet housing need, despite the impact on the Green Belt.</p> <p>In their response, SODC have indicated that they have no objection to the case for Very Special Circumstances that has been made, ie they accept the Principle of Development</p>

Theme (no of responders commenting on this theme)	Illustrative Comments	Parish Council/Steering Group Response
		<p>They have made recommendations about how to present the case within the Basic Conditions Statement.</p> <p>The PC/SG position is that NDO is compliant with planning policies and that no further changes to the NDO design are required on these grounds. The Basic Conditions statement will be updated to reflect recommendations. The decision whether or not to proceed should be taken by the community as a whole at Referendum.</p>
Conservation Area (17)	<p>I would urge serious reconsideration of developing and building on this scale in a green belt conservation area. This will not only set a precedent for our village, inviting more encroachment on remaining green spaces in the future, but also surrounding villages in Oxfordshire. The green spaces within our village (including the Paddock and Allotment), and the commitment to this being a conservation area, have enabled the village to preserve its quintessential rural character. To develop a village like ours is to destroy the very rural nature of the village which we love.</p> <p>We are not opposed to the building of houses, but we do oppose building on conservation ground. This has always been rejected and we see no reason why this should be any different. Also, building 4 executive homes on the "paddock" side of the road, especially at the reduction of low cost / affordable homes deviates completely from the original desires of the community. We note it does however, significantly inflate the developers' profit margin!</p> <p>Further, to build an extension to the school and a doctor's surgery in the proposed location will further exacerbate the horrendous existing traffic situation, as any resident close to the traffic lights between 8:30 - 9:30 and 3:30 - 6:30 will attest.</p>	<p>The justification for development in a Conservation Area is set out in the Heritage Statement included with the supporting documentation.</p> <p>Paragraph 202 of the NPPF states "Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use."</p> <p>The level of harm that might be caused to the conservation area falls very much at the lower end of 'less than substantial harm' as</p>

Theme (no of responders commenting on this theme)	Illustrative Comments	Parish Council/Steering Group Response
	<p>There remains significant other development alternatives within the village that fulfill the needs of most of the NDO, without compromising the conservation area, and we wish they be considered at the earliest opportunity.</p> <p>One of the potential unintended consequence of the NDO’s proposed development is that If we give permission to build on our conservation area, we will end up exposing the adjacent land to potential further development in the future, particularly along the proposed by-pass road, as this area does not benefit from the same protections as the village does. As stated in the planning regulations an NDO should not damage the character or appearance of a conservation area: building on the conservation area in our village does not meet this condition.</p> <p>Policy ENV8 Conservation Areas states that development within the Conservation Area must conserve or enhance its special interest, character, setting and appearance. The proposed development does not fulfil these requirements</p>	<p>that term is defined and used in the NPPF and the accompanying PPG.</p> <p>In their response, SODC’s Conservation and Design Team support present draft of the NDO and welcome the evidence base alongside it. They expect there will be some less than substantial harm which will need to be offset by public benefit.</p> <p>Public Benefits are set out in Section 3 of the NDO. The PC/SG position is that benefits arising from the NDO outweigh the degree of ‘heritage harm’ caused.</p> <p>Historic England have responded to the consultation and have no specific comments to make.</p> <p>The PC/SG position is that benefits arising from the NDO outweigh the degree of ‘heritage harm’ caused, that no further changes to the NDO are required, and that subject to the NDO being compliant with planning policies (“The Basic Conditions”), the decision whether or not to proceed with development the Conservation Area should</p>

Theme (no of responders commenting on this theme)	Illustrative Comments	Parish Council/Steering Group Response
		be taken by the community as a whole, at Referendum.
GP Surgery (20)	<p>We have asked questions in the past about the Surgery Plans and got no clear answers. This has now become an issue for a lot of people given the resignation of Dr James who we thought had committed, with Dr Steinbrecher, to take ownership of the Surgery and business as part of the NDO plans. Please see below extract from email of January 2021 responding to the first set of proposals. "There should be greater clarity on some of the benefits and how they will be achieved. For example, if the ownership of the Post Office/Store moves to the CLT, does it mean that the community will receive some benefit in terms of rent? Similarly, if the CLT owns the Surgery, will the community benefit from rental income? And, indeed, what happens if the doctors decide to leave? Is it ours or an NHS responsibility to recruit replacement doctors?"</p> <p>The GP practice, which is organised as a business partnership, have not been prepared to commit to the proposed new surgery - even in such a lowly and commonly expected form as a non-binding letter of intent, which, for a key development of this nature to proceed, one would have expected them to do so, as a minimum. The fact that they have not done so raises serious questions as to their commitment to the village surgery, as does their record of attendance and engagement with the NDO process thus far. Furthermore, recent departures from the partnership - with no signs of replacement - only serve to deepen this concern. Without the active and definite engagement of the partnership itself then no new surgery will proceed at all</p> <p>It is also important to ask, what will happen if no new surgery building is built ? In my view, the most likely answer is that the existing surgery will continue ! There has been no indication to my knowledge, from any official source, that Clifton Hampden will lose the current facility if we do not make a new building available. Vitally,</p>	<p>The evidence supporting the case for a new surgery and the letter of support from the Oxfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group set out in the supporting documentation has been updated.</p> <p>New evidence has been included: -A Letter of Intent committing to the new surgery.</p> <p>The Viability Assessment (Stage2) sets out the financial assumptions demonstrating viability. The working assumption is that the Surgery practice will purchase the building at cost. However, the option remains for the partners to lease the building from a 3<sup>rd</sup> party, which could be the development partner or an investor. It is now proposed that the freehold will held by the community via the CLT. The agreed ownership arrangements will be set out in the Section 106 agreement in due course.</p> <p>The new, expanded surgery will accommodate a growth in services and numbers across the PCN to address the</p>

Theme (no of responders commenting on this theme)	Illustrative Comments	Parish Council/Steering Group Response
	<p>merely creating a new surgery building to replace the already existing and functioning facility in no way meets the key planning regulation-test of ‘Very Special Circumstances’, that is required in order to approve development on the Green Belt.</p> <p>Having seen some of the concerns regarding the surgery in some of the consultation responses, I would like to confirm Clifton Hampden Surgery support the NDO proposal and have every intention of occupying the new building to be able to continue supplying GP services to the community. Amy Laker (Practice Manager of Clifton Hampden Surgery - submitted on behalf of the Practice)</p> <p>The new surgery would still be in the centre of the village, attracting around 6000 patients from outside the parish (at least a 100% increase of outside patients). Other options seem far more sensible such as renovating and extending the existing surgery (across the large garden) retaining the current patient numbers or if a bigger surgery is required locating near the petrol station or the end of the Oxford Road. An open, grown up conversation about our surgery needs to take place, do we really want a large surgery that serves many times our population in the centre of our very small village?</p> <p>In addition, the whole primary care / NHS direction is to shift certain services back to GP medical practices, requiring large medical centres with a range of services well beyond GP, Nurse and Pharmacy. The proposed GP surgery is inadequate in scale to meet these needs and is in an inappropriate location at the centre of a historic village, already plagued with traffic, noise, congestion, pollution and child safety issues.</p> <p>In terms of the benefits the NDO will bring to the village, a new surgery appears to be the cornerstone. However, on reflection we do question whether it is necessary or ‘fit for purpose’ for a small rural village. It is hard to understand why Clifton Hampden should be burdened with providing for 6000 residents (10x the village population). Access to, and quality of doctors is of far greater importance than modernity of the</p>	<p>complexity of integrated care for the benefit of patients and PCN staff alike.</p> <p>Whilst some growth is expected, the PC/SG and Surgery partners do not recognise the figure of 6,000 patients quoted in many responses. The level of support amongst residents for a new surgery, as evidenced in the Statement of Community Involvement, is overwhelming.</p> <p>PC/SG view is that the case for a new surgery has been made, and that other than the additional information referred to above, no further changes to the NDO are required, and that subject to the NDO being compliant with planning policies (“The Basic Conditions”), the decision whether or not to proceed with development of a new surgery as part of the NDO should be taken by the community as a whole, at Referendum.</p>

Theme (no of responders commenting on this theme)	Illustrative Comments	Parish Council/Steering Group Response
	<p>building. The new expanded surgery may in time prove to negatively impact the doctor patient ratio along with the detrimental effect of yet more village traffic. It also seems that a significantly oversized surgery will give further reason for the council and developers to justify significant additional housing in the parish. The existing Surgery has always met our demands extremely well, and we see no reason to drastically change it.</p> <p>We need a new doctors surgery. The current converted residence is not fit for purpose and needs to be replaced. Moving the surgery to the edge of the village will reduce the total through traffic and there will be less cars turning down into Watery lane. This will mean that the lights will not need to allow access from Watery Lane as often and therefore improve traffic flow.</p>	
<p>Traffic and Parking (30)</p>	<p>Whilst all these new houses are being built where are the improved roads. I live on the Oxford Road - weeding the front of the house is terrifying because of the volume and speed of the traffic.</p> <p>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>Car Parking is one of the biggest problems in Clifton Hampden and we can spend a lot of time debating at PC meetings or try and solve it now while the opportunity is there. In short, there should be a substantial amount of parking on the allotments site, across the road from the school. This should also solve the school parking problem during drop off and pick up. Facilities should include Bike Rack and EV charging points.</p> <p>The allocation of the Barley Mow Car Park as the main village car park is inadequate and inconvenient, which is why people prefer to park wherever they can on the CH side of the bridge.</p>	<p><b>Parking.</b></p> <p>The NDO will provide:</p> <p>9 additional parking spaces for the surgery 5 additional parking spaces for the village hall and general use 18 new parking spaces by the burial ground.</p> <p>The new 'town square' between the surgery and village hall, access to which is controlled with a removeable bollard, providing further limited parking for special events</p>

Theme (no of responders commenting on this theme)	Illustrative Comments	Parish Council/Steering Group Response
	<p>Practical Issues with the NDO as proposed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) The siting of the proposed new burial grounds without appropriate access or nearby car parking, nor scope for supporting ancillary buildings and facilities;</li> <li>(ii) A lack of parking provision at the repurposed village hall site, where competition for spaces from teachers, parents, GP surgery attendees, overflows from the new housing development, as well as temporary visitors to the village, will likely create regular mayhem and annoyance elsewhere in the village;</li> <li>(iii) The very significant increase in traffic flow to the present village hall site will likely compound the already severe issues noted by many, at the traffic lights on the Clifton Hampden crossroads</li> </ul> <p>The unintended consequences of this plan could lead to intolerable traffic and parking congestion in the village center. The recent issue regarding parking in front of the post office (which the Parish Council is aware of so I won't detail here) demonstrates how even subtle changes to the village can have significant consequences in a village that is already under considerable traffic and parking pressure.</p> <p>The enlargement of the surgery, mainly to service those outside the village, will in my view only make matters worse, especially as its seems only minimal additional parking has been allocated to the new surgery. Any further development to the school presents the same problem of increasing pressure on parking in the village. There is no guarantee over the proposed bypass and therefore traffic could continue to flow through the village centre and will now be servicing an increased surgery and increased numbers of residents in the village.</p> <p>I would want to see far more consideration and concrete plans regarding parking that not only neutralises additional development but actually improves the quality of life for residents in the village centre, including schemes that focus on residents, such as resident parking at the wharf, as I fear that it's quite possible that we will reach the</p>	<p>This represents a total of 32 additional spaces bringing the total to 55 compared with current provision of 23</p> <p>In response to comments about improving parking for existing residents. Private parking is a matter for individual homeowners to consider when purchasing their properties. Homeowners who do not have private parking spaces depend on shared public parking spaces for themselves and their visitors. Additional parking provided by the NDO will alleviate some of the current issues particularly during school drop off and collection. Should the NDO not proceed, visitors to the parish will lose their entitlement to park in the Barley Mow car park, potentially making the problem of illegal parking on the High Street and elsewhere considerably worse.</p> <p>The provision of residents parking is not a matter for the NDO, but has been taken up by the Parish Council.</p> <p><b>Transport and Traffic</b></p>



Theme (no of responders commenting on this theme)	Illustrative Comments	Parish Council/Steering Group Response
	<p>point where a number of residents who live on the high street will not be able to park their cars anywhere in the village.</p> <p>Traffic / parking – there are currently 20 parking spaces, the NDO provides for 22, yet the proposed surgery is twice the size and for some reason the school is going to get bigger. Unfortunately, the NDO plan demands more parking, but the NDO is not providing more parking - why do we want our green spaces turned into a car park or the village even further ambushed with parked cars?</p> <p>Further, to build an extension to the school and a doctor's surgery in the proposed location will further exacerbate the horrendous existing traffic situation, as any resident close to the traffic lights between 8:30 - 9:30 and 3:30 - 6:30 will attest.</p> <p>The new expanded surgery may in time prove to negatively impact the doctor patient ratio along with the detrimental effect of yet more village traffic.</p> <p>There does not seem to be sufficient parking for both residents and visitors to the surgery. Are there plans in place for residents only parking spaces?</p> <p>I am also concerned about additional traffic. The proposed by-pass appears to be in doubt and access from the two development sites in the village will be dangerous.</p> <p>No provision has been made for the increased traffic through / around the village and the road safety of pedestrians (particularly the young and elderly). No provision has been made for the parking requirements of a new school and surgery.</p> <p>The most recent plans for the new developments have omitted any provision for parents bringing their children to school by car. Twice a day in term-time, there may be thirty or forty cars requiring</p>	<p>The Transport Strategy concludes that the proposals will not have an unacceptable impact on highway safety or have severe impacts on the road network</p> <p>In their response to the consultation, OCC have asked for more information on a range of topics, the responses to which are reflected in an updated Transport Strategy.</p> <p>PC/SG view is that no further response or action is required in respect of the matters raised .</p>

Theme (no of responders commenting on this theme)	Illustrative Comments	Parish Council/Steering Group Response
	<p>parking at the start and end of the school day. At present, about 8 cars can be accommodated on the recreation field car park, 24 at the Village Hall carpark and others park at the bus stop or in the village. How will this demand be catered for in the new plans? In the new plans, there is inadequate provision for car parking for Village Hall events, for the doctors' surgery and to cater for funerals held at the proposed new burial ground. The Village Hall car park at present is well used. Space is needed near the entrance to allow users to off-load equipment for musical events, for art classes and other events yet the current plans will not</p> <p>I understand that the decision about provision of a new bypass, which has been reviewed and discussed over a number of years is now in the balance. How is the new development - albeit quite a small one - going to impact upon the already problematic traffic, particularly during rush hours? Is this development dependent on the bypass going ahead or not?</p> <p>Traffic: the proposed access to site B is on a blind bend on a busy road. In our view access to other sites, such as G or H, would be safer. Also, if the bypass does not go ahead, there is no plan to ameliorate the significant impact on the traffic on the A415 caused by the houses and the greatly expanded surgery and school. It seems reckless to base the plan entirely on a bypass which may not happen. Clearly, the development should be conditional on the bypass. In any event, even if the bypass is built, there will be years of increased traffic for a period of time until it is built. We also note the traffic report was based on a survey in the last week of school term - only 4 school days - and when the private schools were shut. Traffic to many schools in the area will have been reduced when the survey was done. Why was this week selected please?</p>	

Theme (no of responders commenting on this theme)	Illustrative Comments	Parish Council/Steering Group Response
<p>Consultation Process (3)</p>	<p>The legislation for the NDO makes it very clear that if it is to be successful, any plan must have the consent of the community. Indeed, we will all be expected to vote on whether or not to accept the NDO. However, the truth is that the way in which the process has been handled in our parish has been extremely divisive. Meetings have been held in secret, people have been excluded from meetings, parish council meetings have been abandoned half-way through, there have been various 'side-deals' that do not look good to outsiders and, perhaps most seriously of all, there has been a lack of representation for half the parish. There are no parish councillors for Burcot and the Parish Council has categorically refused to appoint anyone, despite offers by several people to take on the role. The consequence is that we have a PC that does not appear to be interested in Burcot and has not even considered possible development in this part of the parish. Perhaps an NDO could have worked better in Burcot. We will never know, because the PC is fixated on Clifton Hampden and the preoccupations of the Gibbs family trust(s). I cannot believe that an inspector will accept that the NDO reflects the wishes of the entire community when the PC has done so much to limit the representation of views from half the parish.</p> <p>I am concerned about the various flaws in the consultation process, including this particular consultation. It would have been far better to have had anonymised comments, handled by a third party, instead of by people who are closely involved in pushing for the NDO. Many people in our parish are tenants of the landlords at the centre of these proposals. Who can be sure that they will feel free to express their opinions, when they know they will be read by the landlords and their supporters?</p> <p>We have already expressed concerns on behalf of a large group of residents relating to the way the NDO process has been managed. We understand that these issues, which remain, need to be raised with the Independent Examiner and so we will not make further reference to them here.</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 Statement of Community Involvement.</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 development proposals. 76% of Burcot Residents supported the proposals; only 17% were against.</p> <p>The PC/SG has discretion over the level of confidentiality given to responders to a statutory consultation. The policy of confidentiality for this consultation was set out in the Consultation Privacy Statement. The decision to publish names (but not addresses) of all respondents alongside their comments was taken as a response to criticism from some residents that the Informal Consultation was not transparent because residents' responses were not</p>

Theme (no of responders commenting on this theme)	Illustrative Comments	Parish Council/Steering Group Response
		<p>published. An undertaking of confidentiality was given for responses to the Informal Consultation.</p> <p>The issue of membership of the Parish Council is addressed under the Theme 'Governance'.</p> <p>Whilst the comment concerning the concerns raised by the author on behalf of residents is not specific, the PC/SG assume that it refers to two (unpublished) letters to the PC known as L1 and L2. The letters raised concerns over:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Site Selection</li> <li>-Governance, including terms of reference and membership of the steering group, selection of the development partner, and the management of conflicts of interest.</li> <li>-Consultation and Mandate</li> </ul> <p>The complaints raised were investigated by a Parish Councillor who was not involved in the key site selection workshop of 19th January 2019, and is not a member of the NDO Steering Group. An opinion from Counsel was obtained. In their response (also unpublished) to the complainants the Parish Council concluded:</p>

Theme (no of responders commenting on this theme)	Illustrative Comments	Parish Council/Steering Group Response
		<p>- that they were satisfied the selection of the two sites was conducted in a fair manner and in accordance with the process of putting together a CRtBO/NDO.</p> <p>-that the TORs for the SG required modification, but neither this nor any other matters raised rendered the NP and NDO process illegal or unfair.</p> <p>- The Parish Council and the two Steering Groups have exceeded all statutory requirements for community consultation for an NP or NDO at this stage of development.</p> <p>PC/SG view is that no further response or action is required in respect of the matters raised.</p> <p>Should an Independent Examiner require sight of L1, L2 , Counsel’s opinion and PC response, copies will be submitted.</p>
Loss of Rural Charm (6)	<p>We can grow our villages gradually using infill if we need to. It is shocking to even consider building on the Paddock site in particular which is currently a beautiful untouched field in the heart of our village, made more beautiful by the wildflowers, animals grazing and the simple lanes and scruffy wooden fences that line it and we should be doing all we can to keep it that way.</p> <p>As a young person who has lived in Clifton Hampden all my life (I am eighteen years old), I believe that the current plan would produce unintended and detrimental</p>	<p>The PC/SG do not agree that the proposals will lead to a loss of rural charm, or restrict access to green spaces.</p> <p>Both sites are currently privately owned. There is no public access to the paddock site, and access to the southern half of the allotments site is at the discretion of the</p>

Theme (no of responders commenting on this theme)	Illustrative Comments	Parish Council/Steering Group Response
	<p>consequences on our (currently) idyllic village. The building work that has been proposed alone would be incredibly disruptive to the villagers, causing noise and pollution, to our normally quiet and peaceful community. Clifton Hampden’s rural charm would be entirely lost by the increased traffic and chaos caused by lack of available parking. I would love to have the opportunity to buy a car, and be more independent and mobile, but with nowhere to park it, even now in the village, that remains unrealistic, despite living here all my life. The proposed development of the village is very upsetting to me as a young person who’s grown up here and spent my entire primary school years at the village school. I would be so sad and disappointed if the history and rural charm of the village was lost to the proposed development.</p> <p>It would be a great shame should the paddock field be developed on, as all sorts of animals have lived in that field, both wild and domesticated. It is untouched and beautiful. As kids we used to watch a family of foxes play in the paddock, more recently a family of muntjacs and during this summer a healthy bat population. Walk down the path early in the morning or as the sun is setting, you will not see a better view.</p> <p>The National Lockdowns also showed how our rural community was valued by so many others as well, with people coming to the village to walk their dogs, swim, boat and paddle board on the river, and enjoy being outdoors together. In particular, the young people in the village, who were so badly impacted by the lockdowns, were regularly out walking and cycling and playing in the Paddock and Allotment areas – I myself regularly cycled and walked there with my then 11 year old son, while the school was closed to pupils, to get valuable exercise, and learn about nature and the environment. The green spaces in our village have provided solace and comfort and a source of well-being to so many within our community as well as those outside it too.</p>	<p>landowner. The northern half of the allotments site is given over to agriculture and public access is restricted to adjacent public footpaths.</p> <p>The NDO will result in the ownership of the undeveloped areas of both sites, passing either into community ownership, or in the case of the burial ground, the Parochial Parish Council. The public will have access to these spaces.</p> <p>PC/SG view is that, subject to the NDO being compliant with planning policies (“The Basic Conditions”), the decision whether or not to proceed with development should be taken by the community as a whole, at Referendum.</p> <p>No further response or action is required in respect of the matters raised.</p>
Impact on Wildlife (6)	I am in strong opposition to the NDO for these reasons: Environmental concerns: threat to indigenous wildlife and destruction of habitats	The potential impact and recommended mitigations for potential loss of habitat are set

Theme (no of responders commenting on this theme)	Illustrative Comments	Parish Council/Steering Group Response
	<p>DAMAGE TO WILDLIFE: There has been no consideration in proposed development plans given to the negative impact on a significant amount of wildlife in the area that will be displaced and / or lost forever.</p> <p>Vital wildlife will be lost to the village. On Site A, for example, there is rich flora and fauna including bats, owls, deer, muntjac, walnut trees, numerous habitats and plant life.</p> <p>UK nature is in crisis. 41% of the UK's species are declining with 13% at risk of national extinction. Green spaces do not only support resident flora and fauna, but also linkages for migrating species. Small invertebrates, who play a key role in the health of our ecosystems are particularly vulnerable to changes in the environment of the proposed type and scale.</p> <p>There is a significant amount of wildlife in the area of the proposed development that will be displaced and / or lost forever.</p>	<p>out in the Ecology Appraisal included in the evidence papers. Recommended mitigation and enhancement measures will be implemented in full.</p> <p>The anticipated Biodiversity Net Gain, set out in the Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment submitted with the evidence papers, is 29.5% This considerably exceeds planning policy target of 10%.</p> <p>PC/SG view is that no further response or action is required in respect of the matters raised.</p>
Benefits (3)	<p>There should be greater clarity on some of the benefits and how they will be achieved. For example, if the ownership of the Post Office/Store moves to the CLT, does it mean that the community will receive some benefit in terms of rent? Similarly, if the CLT owns the Surgery, will the community benefit from rental income? And, indeed, what happens if the doctors decide to leave? Is it ours or an NHS responsibility to recruit replacement doctors?"</p> <p>The key community benefit promoted in support of the NDO - namely the building of a new doctor's surgery – is not at all assured, leaving the community at risk of voting for an NDO which will actually only ensure that all the unwanted, negative effects of housing development do occur, without absolute guarantees of this alleged benefit being delivered in return.</p>	<p>The Benefits delivered by the NDO are set out in Section 3.</p> <p>In response to the questions raised:</p> <p>The CLT will receive rental income for the building housing the Post Office and Stores. It is anticipated this will be used for the upkeep of the building.</p> <p>Ownership of the surgery building is a matter for negotiation between the surgery partners</p>

Theme (no of responders commenting on this theme)	Illustrative Comments	Parish Council/Steering Group Response
	<p>Practical Issues with the NDO as proposed: the usage of certain aspects of the scheme's 'community benefits' are not well supported by the NDO's actual design proposal, for example: the siting of the proposed new burial grounds without appropriate access or nearby car parking, nor scope for supporting ancillary buildings and facilities</p> <p>I cannot see the argument for building 17 houses in a single development (none of them affordable for most people, most especially given the current economic crisis we are in) in the heart of the village, to the detriment of the environment and the rural character of the village.</p>	<p>and the development partner. Options include purchase and rental.</p> <p>The CLT will not own the surgery, but may own the freehold of the land on which the surgery is built.</p> <p>New 'grass crete' parking is located next to the burial ground.</p> <p>Other than the proposed lychgate, no requirement for ancillary buildings and facilities is foreseen.</p> <p>PC/SG view is that, subject to the NDO being compliant with planning policies ("The Basic Conditions"), the decision whether or not to proceed with development and the benefits that will result should be taken by the community as a whole, at Referendum.</p> <p>No further response or action is required in respect of the matters raised.</p>
Unique Proposal (3)	If one were in any doubt as to the highly unusual nature of this NDO - and the anticipated effects on our long established and cherished, historic environment, then one need not look any further than the words of the Council's own experts, from a	The advice that the proposal is unique is a statement of fact.



Theme (no of responders commenting on this theme)	Illustrative Comments	Parish Council/Steering Group Response
	<p>number of independent departments, including Planning, Landscape and Conservation, as stated within SODC’s own formal Pre-Application advice letter. Specifically, the Planning officer indicates that an NDO proposal such as ours has never occurred before in the county and is also unheard of to the best of their knowledge in the entirety of the whole country!</p> <p>The pre-application advice from SODC’s Senior Planning Officer (Major Applications) has a paragraph on page 5 as follows: “The proposal is a unique one in South Oxfordshire and I am not aware of a similar proposal in such a context anywhere else nationally. The site is notably within Green Belt, has a sensitive heritage setting, is adjacent to public rights of way and is largely not considered to be previously developed land.” I find this comment disturbing. Are we to be the first Parish in the country to vote for the destruction of its Green Belt and Conservation area? I don’t think the Localism Act was passed to enable such self-destruction.</p>	<p>In his Opinion, Counsel offers the following observation:</p> <p>In summary, the proposal is an exemplar of what the Government intended for CRBOs and NDOs through the Localism Act 2011 (and consequent amendments to the TCPA 1990). It reflects the extensive work undertaken by the Parish Council’s Steering Group and the helpful support offered by the District Council pursuant to their statutory duty under paragraph 3 of Schedule 4B TCPA 1990, and NPPF paragraph 52.</p> <p>PC/SG view is that, subject to the NDO being compliant with planning policies (“The Basic Conditions”), the decision whether or not to proceed with development should be taken by the community as a whole, at Referendum.</p> <p>No further response or action is required in respect of the matters raised.</p>
Missing Documentation (2)	<p>In order to consider the NDO proposal fully, it would be appropriate that the community receive access to all the needed information. Examples of key documents or other information that are missing for the community’s consideration include:</p> <p>(i) The SODC Pre-Application advice refers to numerous appendices attached to the advice letter - which offer a more detailed critique of the NDO proposal - but these have not been made available for community review, including SODC drainage</p>	<p>The appendices were omitted in error, and have been published on the Parish Council Website.</p>

Theme (no of responders commenting on this theme)	Illustrative Comments	Parish Council/Steering Group Response
	<p>engineer’s report, Oxford County Council’s Local Lead Flood Authority’s comments, and, Oxford County Council’s financial requirements in relation to the proposed development, with respect to educational and waste management provisions. These documents will provide the community with vital information regarding the monetary liabilities it is being asked to adopt with the NDO as proposed;</p> <p>(ii) The landscape and Visual Impact assessment presented does not provide sufficient information and by omission of photographs, from certain viewpoints, fails to highlight the inevitable negative consequences of the proposed NDO, in respect of degraded outlooks from existing public viewpoints, as well as the adverse changes to the nature of the settlement’s current pattern.</p> <p>(iv) No environmental noise assessment or noise mitigation scheme (to address policies ENV11 &amp; ENV12) have been provided and thus the NDO as proposed is at risk of requiring further amendment only after the community has undertaken this review, rather than before it</p> <p>Please can you make public all appendices to the SODC letter dated 14 February 22. These appear to be important documents.</p>	
Flood Risk (4)	<p>Insufficient infrastructure to support proposed developments - Flooding concerns: risk not assessed/ameliorated in plans</p> <p>FLOODING: The development will increase the risk of flooding in the village and no provision has been made to adequately assess and alleviate this risk. Please ensure that no flooding issue is caused by the development. Water flows down naturally from site B towards the existing buildings which has not caused any issues for us, but if water flow were increased by the development that could cause issues. Similarly, drains and sewage must be managed carefully to avoid issues arising.</p>	<p>Flood Risk is addressed in section 2.2.3 of the Flood Risk and Surface Water Drainage Strategy.</p> <p>The Long Term Flood Risk Map for England (gov.uk) shows the Site to be at negligible to no risk of flooding from rivers, the sea or reservoirs. The mapping tool also shows very low risk of surface water flooding across the entire site area. The flood risk map is based on mathematical modelling, considering surfaces, topology and existing land uses. No</p>

Theme (no of responders commenting on this theme)	Illustrative Comments	Parish Council/Steering Group Response
		<p>significant flooding occurs from the proposed surface water drainage strategy, so the risk of surface water flooding will continue to be negligible across the Site.</p> <p>No further response or action is required in respect of the matters raised.</p>
<p>Housing Need (12)</p>	<p>The NP survey results were quite clear in that residents did not want large houses of 5 or more bedrooms and did not want single developments of more than 5 houses – this has been ignored in the NDO.</p> <p>While the NDO SG have now reached a much more acceptable mix of housing, in line with the needs of the Parish, there are still large houses on the Paddock Site which are not necessary as we have so many large houses in the Parish already. I understand the requirement for the builders to make a profit but, if possible, we should try to reach it by only building houses we need.</p> <p>Housing ‘need’ not clearly established or provided-for by the NDO: When the community voted to explore the possibility of providing some affordable housing, plus step-down appropriate housing within the Parish, they were not, I believe, expecting in return a plan funded by the provision of homes valued above a million pounds and crucially, without any affordable homes provision.</p> <p>Necessity of development itself? - Developments at Culham providing adequate local housing and facilities - Do not understand how the large properties are fulfilling the demand for affordable houses</p>	<p>The case for new housing is set out in Section 6 of the NDO, supported by the Housing Needs Analysis prepared by AECOM and included within the supporting documentation.</p> <p>In their supplementary Report, AECOM quantify the need for new housing, which they set at c25 smaller, i.e. 1-3 bed houses.</p> <p>A significant majority of residents have expressed their support for new housing at every stage of consultation up to and including the Informal Consultation (November 2020 – March 2021).</p> <p>-In the 2014 Village Plan survey, residents expressed a need for 1-4 bed houses, in broadly equal measure. There was some support for 5 bed houses.</p>

Theme (no of responders commenting on this theme)	Illustrative Comments	Parish Council/Steering Group Response
	<p>HOUSING NEED?: The proposed increase in housing stock on offer is marginal taking into consideration the large developments proposed nearby (e.g. Culham – 3,500 homes) that will provide adequate local housing and other community facilities without having to destroy the nature of the village. This is an important point which has not been satisfactorily addressed.</p> <p>The housing needs surveys in the original Neighbourhood Development Plan demonstrated only a demand for up to ten smaller homes split between two sites.</p> <p>As another local resident has stated to you ‘SODC pre-application advice Housing Need - How would the development proposals ensure that it would meet local need? Would there need to be some form of legal agreement in place to ensure the proposed dwellings will meet a local need in perpetuity? Has a local connection mechanism been considered? Is the strength of the evidence of a need sufficiently robust to demonstrate a significant housing need’?</p> <p>Large houses – from the 2014/18 surveys people clearly stated they did not wish for any big houses to be built. We did not ask for or need the large houses on the Paddock field. Remove the large houses from this development.</p> <p>Large developments – from the 2014/18 survey people clearly stated they did not want large developments. We did not ask for or need 17 new houses in a single development.</p> <p>The lower cost housing will enable people to afford to stay in the village. The ground floor apartments will be suitable for those who are less mobile.</p>	<p>-In the 2018 consultation, residents agreed with a draft policy (summarised) of developing 25-30 houses, primarily smaller housing but with some larger housing to generate financial benefit for the community.</p> <p>-In the 2020 consultation support for new housing remained very strong, with preference for smaller houses.</p> <p>-In their HNA, AECOM state the need (primarily but not exclusively) for smaller and more affordable market homes to accommodate both younger households and those wishing to downsize who currently lack suitable options. And for some Affordable Housing.</p> <p>The provision in the NDO of a few larger houses (2 x 4 bed, 3 x 5 bed) results both from the evidence of need set out in previous consultations and the HNA, and the need to generate financial benefit for the community, an objective of the NDO. The financial evidence is set out in the Viability Assessment.</p> <p>In the 2014 survey and subsequent consultations, residents expressed a</p>

Theme (no of responders commenting on this theme)	Illustrative Comments	Parish Council/Steering Group Response
	<p>A very modest suggestion of a few additional small houses for downsizing or first-time buyers in the Neighbourhood Plan has been hi-jacked by a proposal for a new doctors' surgery and 17 houses within the Conservation Area to enable the landowner to maximise his profits. There is no evidence of local housing need on the scale proposed</p> <p>Everything about the NDO has been designed with the interests of the landlords at its centre. Land that would once have been almost valueless because it was in a conservation area will suddenly become worth millions if this NDO goes through. The beneficiaries - various elements of the wealthy Gibbs family - have worked out that they can make a lot of money by pushing through the NDO. Although the supporters of this scheme started out by talking about 'affordable housing' and the potential benefits to the community, the latest variant of the scheme makes it clear that this is a housing scheme for those who can afford to buy. The idea of helping less well-off households get a foot on the housing ladder had disappeared completely. As for the housing planned for the Paddock site, it is simply housing for millionaires.</p> <p>In my view, the new plan with fewer and more suitable housing, meets the requirements that were requested by villagers in the original consultation and is in keeping with the current architecture in the village.</p>	<p>preference for a larger number of smaller developments, rather than a few larger ones. As only two sites have been identified that have the potential for development of the type and scale required, the PC/SG have been unable to offer options for a scheme that meets this preference.</p> <p>PC/SG view is that, subject to the NDO being compliant with planning policies ("The Basic Conditions"), the decision whether or not to proceed with development should be taken by the community as a whole, at Referendum.</p> <p>No further response or action has been taken in respect of the matters raised.</p>
<p>Site Selection (3)</p>	<p>SITE SELECTION: The process of the selection (sites A and B) has been executed by a small and selective committee overrun by vested interests. Community voices have been silenced on questioning this issue. This is of serious concern especially where</p>	<p>The site selection process is described in Section 7 of the NDO, and supported by the Green belt Assessment of Potential Development sites conducted by AECOM.</p>

Theme (no of responders commenting on this theme)	Illustrative Comments	Parish Council/Steering Group Response
	<p>brown field sites, more environmentally compatible with development, have been offered for development, yet dismissed.</p> <p>I am not satisfied with the robustness of the site selection process. The map published by the Steering group shows 8 sites around the parish but until now we have not seen any meaningful description in respect of the 6 rejected sites. The Greenbelt assessment of the sites by AECOM was only published in July 2022. We are told that SODC advised that these 6 would not pass the Greenbelt tests. I have seen no evidence of any effort on the part of the Steering group to persuade SODC that although some of these sites might constitute a marginally greater intrusion into the Greenbelt they might be more acceptable to the residents of the Parish. What constitutes a greater intrusion into the Greenbelt appears to be a very subjective matter.</p> <p>Obfuscated future commercial arrangements between the parties profiting from the proposed village centre sites seems to have guided site selection rather than an open transparent selection process</p> <p>Site selection: SODC say in their advice of 14 February 22 they require a "robust site assessment.....to demonstrate an absence of alternatives in the vicinity. " They also ask "Could the use of one site achieve a better outcome or are two sites still required?" In our view the report by Aecom is not a robust site assessment. By way of example only , site G is described as "an agricultural field" . Site B is described as "enclosed on three sides by the built up area of CH". As is well known, B is also used as agricultural land with animals living there and to describe site B as enclosed on three sides by a built up area does not in our view accurately describe the site. There is a very small number of houses next to site B and much of the border is our wooded area which is not built up at all.</p> <p>We also note that SODC confirm in relation to site B: " Although there are existing buildings to the east, south and south-west of this site, they are generally well</p>	<p>Prior to the drafting of the NDO and the Regulation 21 consultation, the decision on site selection and explanation of the process has been extensively communicated to residents in annual village meetings, a paper on the website, and in the PC response to L1 and L2 sent to the group of residents who challenged the process.</p> <p>Of note is that neither the landowner nor the developer were members of the Neighbourhood Plan SG (NP SG) that made the decision to bring forward development via an NDO and owned the site selection process, culminating in their decision on site selection at their meeting of 13 March 2019. Whilst the long standing aspiration of the landowner to develop the allotments site was common knowledge, neither were consulted as part of the site selection process. The NP SG also defined the broad strategy (housing, surgery, improvements to amenities) for development to be brought forward via the NDO, none of which could or were influenced by the landowner or developer.</p>

Theme (no of responders commenting on this theme)	Illustrative Comments	Parish Council/Steering Group Response
	<p>contained by vegetation and do not enclose the site". Development , SODC say, cannot therefore be infill. This conclusion stands in stark contrast to the Aecom comment: "enclosed on three sides by the built up area of CH".</p> <p>You have made repeated references to SODC having advised that A and B were the only two sites that might meet the openness test. However, in July 2019 SODC advised in clear terms that the development on A and B would inevitably fall foul of the openness test. You have unfortunately not included this advice in your public statements recording the history of site selection. It is clear that the open views across site B from all directions will be destroyed by this development.</p>	<p>Minutes of all meetings of the NP SG and the NDO SG can be found on the website [<a href="#">Clifton Hampden &amp; Burcot Parish Council » Meetings</a>]</p> <p>No brownfield sites that have the potential for development of the type and scale envisaged have been identified, or offered by landowners.</p> <p>In their response, SODC welcome the inclusion of AECOM’s Green Belt Assessment submitted with the evidence papers. They have made recommendations as to how the evidence could be better presented in the NDO paper and Basic Conditions Statement.</p> <p>No new information has been submitted that causes the PC/SG to revisit the site selection process, or their decision to proceed with the NDO on the two selected sites.</p> <p>The NDO paper and Basic Conditions statement will be updated to reflect SODC advice. No further response or action will be taken in respect of the matters raised.</p>
Development Partner (2)	<p>DEVELOPMENT PARTNER SELECTION : A lack of due diligence in the selection of development partner Thomas Homes, a developer with no credentials in carbon neutral development / ecologically responsible builds is of serious concern. With large sums of public funding at stake, a tender process should be a first step. In the</p>	<p>An advantage of the NDO process is that it permits the parish council to lead and control the details of the development (e.g. the numbers and position of houses); the scheme</p>

Theme (no of responders commenting on this theme)	Illustrative Comments	Parish Council/Steering Group Response
	<p>current climate/energy crises, a carbon neutral rating should be entry level for all new builds.</p> <p>Has a competition been held to find a builder who will best meet the needs required?</p>	<p>must also deliver a substantial financial benefit to the community, requiring co-operation from a landowner and developer.</p> <p>Thomas Homes was approached in the first instance as development partner following their successful involvement with the Neighbourhood Plan for Long Wittenham Parish Council. The NDOSG were satisfied in the early meetings with Thomas Homes that they were willing to work within the parish council’s parameters for the requirements of the scheme, including the considerable flow of financial benefits to the parish.</p> <p>The process of selection of Thomas Homes as the development partner was tested in by Moore, the auditor of the Parish Council accounts, in investigating a complaint raised by a resident. The report (name of complainant redacted), dated July 2022, can be found on the additional information section of the PC website . <a href="#">Clifton Hampden &amp; Burcot Parish Council » Additional Information</a> The auditor concluded <i>“Our view would be that best practice is that significant projects benefit from a selection of</i></p>



Theme (no of responders commenting on this theme)	Illustrative Comments	Parish Council/Steering Group Response
		<p><i>quotes being obtained. Where a single provider puts forward terms which provide good terms and additional benefits to the local area, the Council, following reasonable scrutiny and consideration, are not precluded from accepting it.</i></p> <p><i>No evidence was submitted to suggest this might breach the Council's Financial Regulations or Standing Orders"</i></p> <p>No further response or action will be taken in respect of the matters raised</p>
Climate Crisis (1)	<p>CLIMATE CRISIS: The proposal fails to adopt best 'environmentally friendly' practice (e.g. carbon negative / neutral dwellings) and the designs of the houses proposed are not in keeping with their surroundings. If development is to go ahead, a full review and tender process to select a development partner with experience in carbon negative / neutral builds should be undertaken.</p>	<p>The environmental credentials of the new homes and surgery are set out in the Design and Access statement.</p> <p>No further response or action will be taken in respect of the matters raised</p>
Public Funds (2)	<p>PUBLIC FUNDING: Transparency on budgets and spending is necessary and overdue - particularly with regards to a £100,000.00 pay award of public funding provided for this project – I'd like to know how my money is being spent.</p> <p>Over £100,000 of public money has been spent to some extent to reduce the commercial risk to the Builder</p>	<p>Public funds have been made available to enable Parish Councils to develop Neighbourhood Plans and Neighbourhood Development Orders, as the Government has recognised that the cost of these would, for most councils, be prohibitive without financial support.</p>

Theme (no of responders commenting on this theme)	Illustrative Comments	Parish Council/Steering Group Response
	<p>Development of both sites and adjoining fields is currently protected by normal planning regulations for the washed over green belt. Why have the proponents of the NDO taken it upon themselves to overcome these protections via the spending of large sums of public funds, in overcoming these barriers to development using weak evidence around site selection, housing need and viability of the new GP surgery.</p>	<p>A breakdown of income to and expenditure of Public Funds for the development of the Neighbourhood Plan and the Neighbourhood Development Order has been published on the PC website</p> <p>End of Grant reports for the 3 grants awarded in respect of the NDO have been published on the website . These set out how the grants were spent. The three grants were:</p> <p>19/20: £7,000 of which £2,000 was returned unspent 20/21: £97,833 21/22: £10,000, of which £3,600 was returned unspent).</p> <p>No further response or action will be taken in respect of the matters raised</p>
<p>Risk of/Precedent for/Protections against Future Development (4)</p>	<p><b>FURTHER DEVELOPMENT:</b> The most concerning of all is that with a development vehicle such as the NDO, further planning applications are not subject to basic levels of scrutiny. This NDO therefore paves the way for an unfettered future building bonanza on any sites across both Clifton Hampden and Burcot.</p> <p>I understand that the surplus land no longer to be developed north of the A415 (i.e. plot A+) will be put into the Community land trust. What conditions will be applied to the trust to prevent development in the future?</p>	<p>Adoption of the NDO (i.e. the grant of planning permission) will not set a precedent for future applications.</p> <p>Future planning applications will be considered on their individual merits, and follow National and Local planning policies and guidelines (“The Basic Conditions”).</p>

Theme (no of responders commenting on this theme)	Illustrative Comments	Parish Council/Steering Group Response
	<p>We believe that if the community take the decision to build on protected greenbelt land this will make the risk of further developments far greater than it currently is. The fact that village would over-rule current protections and vote in favour of this development will seriously weaken any future argument we have to resist more houses, a quarry, science park expansion etc. This has the potential to be the watershed moment that emboldens the council and developers to impose further development on us. We understand the NDO’s comment that this does not set a precedent for future planning, however, the fact that this scheme has got as far as it has, is evidence that protections are vulnerable and therefore our greatest defence against the incessant drive for large housing projects in the county is to support and bolster the current Green Belt protections however we can</p> <p>What protection will be put in place to avoid further development on site B? A covenant in favour of the landowner vendor would not be sufficient in our view. A covenant should be given in favour of the neighbouring properties please.</p>	<p>The PC/SG hold the view that ownership of land is a significant factor in preventing, or promoting development on it – put most simply, development cannot occur without the landowner’s agreement. A benefit of the NDO is that any undeveloped land on both sites that is undeveloped will pass into ownership of the Community Land Trust. Any development proposals brought forward by the CLT will be subject to the same policies and processes as any other proposal. All eligible residents of the parish may join the CLT and elect trustees, thereby influence decisions about future development.</p> <p>PC/SG view is that, subject to the NDO being compliant with planning policies (“The Basic Conditions”), the decision whether or not to proceed with development and concomitant benefits of land ownership, and the risk (real or otherwise) of setting a precedent for future development should be taken by the community as a whole, at Referendum.</p> <p>No further response or action has been taken in respect of the matters raised.</p>
Dependency on Bypass (2)	There is an additional risk that the bypass will not go ahead which combined with the NDO will create an unmanageable situation	The NDO is not dependent on the by-pass.

Theme (no of responders commenting on this theme)	Illustrative Comments	Parish Council/Steering Group Response
	<p>The bypass going ahead should be a prerequisite for the NDO.</p> <p>The new surgery and bypass are at the centre of the NDO. So any plan put forward now to be considered should be conditional - on both a cast iron commitment from the doctors in advance - and also the bypass being built first.</p>	<p>The proposals will result in a modest traffic generation of 13 two-way vehicle movements in the AM peak and 12 two-way vehicle movements in the PM peak.</p> <p>The proposed development is in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (July 2021), which is in favour of sustainable development and advises at paragraph 111 that 'Development should only be prevented or refused on highway grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe'.</p> <p>The PC/SG consider that the development would not have an unacceptable impact on highway safety and the development's transport impacts cannot be regarded as severe.</p>
<p>Governance, Membership of the Parish Council, Steering Groups (6)</p>	<p>Lastly, I would like to note that I appreciate this opportunity enabling the wider community to voice their opinions. It draws a sharp contrast with the conduct of those running the NDO up to this point. Rather than following a 'community led' approach, the steering committee have been selectively appointed. Their collaboration with developers and landowners is alarming and raises serious questions over their intentions with regard to the needs and concerns of the wider community.</p>	<p>Membership of the Parish Council is not a planning matter, and comments on this subject are not relevant to the NDO.</p> <p>However a number of residents have raised this at Parish Council meetings and in this consultation, so it is appropriate to respond.</p>

Theme (no of responders commenting on this theme)	Illustrative Comments	Parish Council/Steering Group Response
	<p>GOVERNANCE TO DATE: The Parish Council have failed to take an impartial and 'community led' approach in developing the NDO plans refusing golden opportunities to partner with highly skilled and experienced local community members, thus closing the door on genuine collaboration. There has been far too much influence from and collaboration with the developers and landowners (who stand to benefit the most financially from the development proceeding and those further down the pipeline), resulting in a plan that ignores concerns of the wider community. Representation on the PC and the NDO Steering Committees has been limited to a small set of long-standing residents with limited debate of options and opinions. Little effort has been made to widen the representational mix. Indeed, despite advertising that they would welcome fresh input, Burcot residents have been denied representation despite there being a vacancy on the PC.</p> <p>The Parish Council have actively refused applications from qualified Burcot residents to fill vacancies on the Parish Council.</p> <p>The legislation for the NDO makes it very clear that if it is to be successful, any plan must have the consent of the community. Indeed, we will all be expected to vote on whether or not to accept the NDO. However, the truth is that the way in which the process has been handled in our parish has been extremely divisive. Meetings have been held in secret, people have been excluded from meetings, parish council meetings have been abandoned half-way thorough, there have been various 'side-deals' that do not look good to outsiders and, perhaps most seriously of all, there has been a lack of representation for half the parish. There are no parish councillors for Burcot and the Parish Council has categorically refused to appoint anyone, despite offers by several people to take on the role. The consequence is that we have a PC that does not appear to be interested in Burcot and has not even considered possible development in this part of the parish. Perhaps an NDO could have worked better in</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-optation 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 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, with one exception, the comments by residents in this consultation fail to mention that some objectors 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</p>

Theme (no of responders commenting on this theme)	Illustrative Comments	Parish Council/Steering Group Response
	<p>Burcot. We will never know, because the PC is fixated on Clifton Hampden and the preoccupations of the Gibbs family trust(s). I cannot believe that an inspector will accept that the NDO reflects the wishes of the entire community when the PC has done so much to limit the representation of views from half the parish.</p>	<p>complaints, defamatory statements, and misinformation was also directed at Parish Councillors and members of the Steering Group.</p> <p>Turning to membership of the steering groups.</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 <a href="#">Clifton Hampden &amp; Burcot Parish Council » Additional Information</a>.</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 commenting on 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 proposal for a new or improved amenity in 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. Its Terms of Reference are set out at <a href="#">[link]</a>. Membership of the SG has varied as individuals have joined and left. No application to join the SG was ever refused. Burcot has been well represented.</p> <p>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 5<sup>th</sup> resident of Burcot joined the SG for a short period.</p>

Theme (no of responders commenting on this theme)	Illustrative Comments	Parish Council/Steering Group Response
		<p>The NDO SG was formed in November 2019. Its Terms of Reference are at <a href="https://cliftonhampden.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/02/20210219-Burcot-and-Clifton-Hampden-Neighbourhood-Development-Order-Steering-Group-TORs-Revised-February-2021-v6-for-endorsement.pdf">https://cliftonhampden.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/02/20210219-Burcot-and-Clifton-Hampden-Neighbourhood-Development-Order-Steering-Group-TORs-Revised-February-2021-v6-for-endorsement.pdf</a> . Its membership, which includes 5 community members, (one of whom is a Burcot resident) the landowner, the development partner, and surgery representative, is appropriate for a project of its type. An application in December 2020 from a resident to join the NDO SG was refused on grounds of conflict of interest – the applicant wished to join specifically to represent their interest as owner of a contiguous property.</p> <p>Unlike a planning application made by a landowner or developer and decided by a planning committee or independent inspector, the NDO requires the active engagement of the community through its development, and is decided by the community at referendum, i.e. it is community led.</p>



Theme (no of responders commenting on this theme)	Illustrative Comments	Parish Council/Steering Group Response
Needs of Burcot (2)	<p>Not enough consideration has been put into the needs of Burcot as a hamlet adjacent Clifton Hampden.</p> <p>These proposals relate solely to housing and community benefits for the residents of Clifton Hampden, while there has been no consideration for the other half of the community (Burcot).</p>	<p>The PC/SG response to this theme is covered under Governance, Membership of the Parish Council, Steering Groups.</p>
Neighbouring Properties (3)	<p>Paddock field – we are against the use of the paddock field as it has never been built on and was never historically discussed as a target for development as far as we are aware. It is a beautiful field and adds significantly to the character of the village. It also affects us personally as a family as we would have a large house where the doorstep would be level with my children’s bedroom windows due to the different ground levels. Withdraw the paddock field from this development.</p> <p>Please can consideration be given to sensitive planning of the houses on site B. They appear very close to our boundary: the proximity and make up and height of the fences will be important to reduce the visual impact and to ensure our privacy is preserved. The height of the houses is also important. The plans suggest windows which are at some height and, as SODC have noted, there needs to be sensitivity to the impact on neighbouring properties. We request that we be consulted with on these issues.</p> <p>SODC say the height and size of the buildings should be restricted so that they do not appear dominant in views from the A415 or from the footpath and are not visible from the High Street. It appears SODC may not realise the proximity to our garden and wooded area but clearly the height and size of the buildings is even more relevant for us.</p>	<p>Since the publication of the initial proposals in the Initial Parish Consultation in November 2020, very significant changes to the scheme have been made in response to residents’ concerns. These changes are best described in the short film published on the website as part of the Regulation 21 consultation: <a href="https://neighbourhoodplan.cliftonhampden.org.uk/">https://neighbourhoodplan.cliftonhampden.org.uk/</a></p> <p>Comments on the impact on neighbouring properties all relate to the Paddock Site. Extensive efforts have been made to minimise the impact on neighbouring properties by reducing the number of dwellings from 5 to 3, and increasing separation from properties to the south. This is balanced by the need to conform to the existing development pattern within the conservation area, so new dwellings are set back from the road to appear as a natural continuation of the existing farm buildings there.</p>

Theme (no of responders commenting on this theme)	Illustrative Comments	Parish Council/Steering Group Response
	<p>SODC also say the development needs to be set back , which we assume means set back towards our property, but again they appear not to appreciate that the houses on site B will be positioned right next to our property. We do not believe this strikes a fair balance.</p> <p>Please note that all trees on our side of the fence between our land and site B are owned by us. We are not certain which trees are being identified in the Venners report, but if T15, TG1, TG2 and G2 are on our side of the fence they should have been noted as owned by a third party. Please ensure that the Developer and all other relevant parties are aware that the wooded area between our garden and site B is in our ownership - it is registered at the Land Registry under a separate title in our names. Please confirm that the trees on our land will not be touched or damaged.</p> <p>From a personal standpoint the proposed housing would be on two sides of our property. We really cherish the open rural views that our property has enjoyed for 120 years, the NDO will irrevocably damage this, as we are sure it will similarly do for others in the village. For us, the negative impact to the landscape, the years of construction disruption, noise, dust, the additional traffic and the risk of subsequent housing expansion far outweighs the benefits of the NDO</p>	<p>In their response, SODC have not raised any issues regarding the impact of the proposals relating to the three comments made.</p> <p>The PC/SG are of the view that every attempt has been made to reduce the impact on neighbouring properties, and the proposals meet the Basic Conditions, including those relating to privacy. No changes to the NDO or supporting documentation have been made in respect of the matters raised</p>
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>Eco-credentials for the new dwellings is set out in the Design and Access Statement:</p> <p>All new homes will offer much greater levels of sustainability than typical existing homes, with significantly reduced 'in use' energy demands delivered by a number and variety of complementary measures including:</p>

Theme (no of responders commenting on this theme)	Illustrative Comments	Parish Council/Steering Group Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Detailed design and construction to meet or exceed continually improving Building Regulations requirements.</li> <li>• ‘Fabric first’ approach to lowering energy usage through improved levels of insulation and air-tightness.</li> <li>• Air source heat pumps provide a renewable heating solution to each dwelling.</li> <li>• Superfast broadband provision with integrated networking to facilitate seamless home working.</li> <li>• Integrated Electric Vehicle (EV) charging points to each home.</li> </ul> <p>The new surgery will be Net Zero energy demand, a 70% improvement on current standards.</p> <p>No changes to the NDO or supporting documentation have been made in respect of the matters raised</p>
Cumulative Development (5)	<p>On top of cumulative development – how much must we take?</p> <p>It is easy to look at this development in isolation, but the reality is it that the proposed plans are adding insult to injury to the numerous planned developments around us: and the proposed large-scale housing and industrial developments at Culham and Berinsfield, the planned Clifton Hampden By-pass, and the proposed solar farm. All of these developments we have no control over and we will have to suffer the consequences of their existence.</p>	<p>The PC has no control and little influence over development proposals outside the PC boundary.</p> <p>This NDO is a response to the threat to the sustainability of our amenities from development to the east and west of the parish. Should these amenities be lost, the</p>

Theme (no of responders commenting on this theme)	Illustrative Comments	Parish Council/Steering Group Response
	<p>Expansion/development schemes in Culham, Berinsfield, Long Wittenham, Brightwell, Didcot expansion, Wallingford expansion, the Science Park and the Burcot solar farm are stark reminders of how rapidly and comprehensively our Green Belt is being impacted. Each scheme might be justifiable in isolation but when taken together you wonder when/where will it stop?</p> <p>Insets in the Green Belt have been allowed for development of the Culham Science Centre, for doubling the size of Berinsfield and building a new settlement of 3000 houses at Culham. Land will also be taken for the new road by-passing Clifton Hampden and a proposal for a Solar Farm at Burcot is under consideration. Several new houses are being developed in Burcot. There is an urgent need to ensure industrialisation and urbanisation do not erode this Green Belt any further.</p> <p>In recent years South Oxfordshire has seen extensive development - many would call it over-development - with most small towns and villages expanding dramatically. Soon the traffic problems caused by this expansion will begin to affect us all. Most of this has little to do with local developments or priorities, but has been driven by poor national housing policies and, sad to say, naked greed. Nor are we at an end of such housing developments. In fact, our parish is surrounded by sites earmarked for further massive expansion of estates - at Berinsfield and at Culham, plus a new by-pass and river crossing that will bring serious traffic problems to our area and the further encroachment onto Greenbelt land by solar farms. These developments have largely been imposed on us by central government and local councils cannot easily avoid them.</p>	<p>parish will become another dormitory community.</p> <p>No changes to the NDO or supporting documentation have been made in respect of the matters raised</p>
Handling of Complaints (1)	The Deputy Monitoring Officer left over to the Examiner the conduct issues raised with SODC, save for a finding of no pecuniary interest, which had not been alleged in the first place.	The PC/SG understand that it is not the role of an NP examiner to determine issues that the law allocates to the monitoring officer.

Theme (no of responders commenting on this theme)	Illustrative Comments	Parish Council/Steering Group Response
		<p>However the independent examiner may find the context for this comment helpful.</p> <p>The Monitoring Officer considered allegations against two parish councillors and the chair of the NDO SG, and decided that no further action should be taken. The MO response to the allegations has been published on the PC website:  <a href="#">Clifton Hampden &amp; Burcot Parish Council</a>  <a href="#">» Additional Information</a></p> <p>No changes to the NDO or supporting documentation have been made in respect of the matters raised</p>
<p>Community Led/Developer and Landowner Led (10)</p>	<p>The NDO doesn't feel community led</p> <p>I would like to note that I appreciate this opportunity enabling the wider community to voice their opinions. It draws a sharp contrast with the conduct of those running the NDO up to this point. Rather than following a 'community led' approach, the steering committee have been selectively appointed. Their collaboration with developers and landowners is alarming and raises serious questions over their intentions with regard to the needs and concerns of the wider community.</p> <p>GOVERNANCE TO DATE: The Parish Council have failed to take an impartial and 'community led' approach in developing the NDO plans refusing golden opportunities to partner with highly skilled and experienced local community members, thus closing the door on genuine collaboration. There has been far too much influence from and collaboration with the developers and landowners (who stand to benefit</p>	<p>The PC/SG response to comments raised under this theme overlaps with our response to issues of governance and membership of the PC and steering groups, and the consultation process. PC/SG responses that are relevant to this theme are drawn together and repeated here.</p> <p>The history of this community led project since inception in 2012 is set out in a paper (Updated October 2022) on the website  <a href="#">Clifton Hampden &amp; Burcot Parish Council</a>  <a href="#">» Additional Information</a></p>

Theme (no of responders commenting on this theme)	Illustrative Comments	Parish Council/Steering Group Response
	<p>the most financially from the development proceeding and those further down the pipeline), resulting in a plan that ignores concerns of the wider community.</p> <p>I object to the proposed NDO as it is inappropriate, not inclusive, and not community led.</p> <p>At present we perceive that the NDO does not represent the community as a whole and the process is not therefore fair. An NDO has to demonstrate that it is community led. These proposals relate solely to housing and community benefits for the residents of Clifton Hampden.</p> <p>Not Community led. This feels more like a developer and landowner led development</p> <p>An NDO has to demonstrate that it is community led. These proposals relate solely to housing and community benefits for the residents of Clifton Hampden, while there has been no consideration for the other half of the community (Burcot). In fact, the Parish Council have actively refused applications from qualified Burcot residents to fill vacancies on the Parish Council</p> <p>The Parish Council have failed to take an impartial and 'community led' approach in developing the NDO plans and there has been far too much influence from and collaboration with the developers and landowners (who stand to benefit the most financially from the development proceeding), resulting in a plan that ignores the concerns of the wider community.</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 Statement of Community Involvement.</p> <p>Every resident has also had the opportunity to sit on the various committees and steering groups leading, ultimately, to the strategy agreed for the NDO at the NP SG meeting on 13 March 2019.</p> <p>The NDO is, in effect, the execution of the strategy agreed by the NP SG. The community is represented on the NDO SG by 5 members, i.e. the majority. Both the chair and deputy chair are community members.</p> <p>Unlike a planning application made by a landowner or developer and decided by a planning committee or independent inspector, the NDO requires the active engagement of the community through its development, and is decided by the</p>

Theme (no of responders commenting on this theme)	Illustrative Comments	Parish Council/Steering Group Response
		<p>community at referendum, i.e. it is community led.</p> <p>No changes to the NDO or supporting documentation have been made in respect of the matters raised.</p>
<p>Viability Assessment (1)</p>	<p>The Viability analysis provided a wealth of figures on projected income and expenditure for the project. We are given both optimistic and pessimistic figures but in the volatile situation in which the country now finds itself I have concerns on what happens if there is a shortfall from the project. Does it mean that there will be a reduction in the benefits to the village?</p> <p>The Viability assessment is marginal at best.</p>	<p>The Stage 1 Viability Assessment.</p> <p>The Viability Assessment will be undertaken in two stages. In this initial stage, the consultant has assessed the nature of the development using the information supplied by the PC and by the development partner Thomas Homes. The Consultant has undertaken a viability assessment of the development based upon their understanding at the time. This is the report that has been made available to the community as part of the Regulation 21 consultation exercise.</p> <p>In their response, SODC indicated that they did not agree with one aspect of the Viability Assessment, namely that the scheme could only support the delivery of 4 Affordable Homes.</p> <p>The PC/SG have commissioned a Stage 2 Viability Assessment included with the evidence base for Submission.</p>

Theme (no of responders commenting on this theme)	Illustrative Comments	Parish Council/Steering Group Response
		<p>The Parish Council’s position remains that the scheme is not commercially viable above the proposed level of 4 AH, and that the NDO is compliant with SODL LP policy H9 which makes provision for alternative proposals on grounds of viability.</p> <p>The NDO will be submitted on this basis.</p>
Landscape Impact (2)	<p>The landscape and Visual Impact assessment presented does not provide sufficient information and by omission of photographs, from certain viewpoints, fails to highlight the inevitable negative consequences of the proposed NDO, in respect of degraded outlooks from existing public viewpoints, as well as the adverse changes to the nature of the settlement’s current pattern</p> <p>The negative impact to the landscape, the years of construction disruption, noise, dust, the additional traffic and the risk of subsequent housing expansion far outweighs the benefits of the NDO</p>	<p>In their response, SODC’s Landscape Officer notes that the LVIA is a shortened version, and that, due to the absence of tables setting out the effects, it is not always clear about how judgements have been determined. The Officer agrees that the impacts are relatively localised and that the mitigation proposals can reduce these to an acceptable level.</p> <p>SODC Landscape Officer recommendations have been addressed for the submission version</p>
SODC Pre-App Advice (where not covered elsewhere) (4)	<p>If one were in any doubt as to the highly unusual nature of this NDO - and the anticipated effects on our long established and cherished, historic environment, then one need not look any further than the words of the Council’s own experts, from a number of independent departments, including Planning, Landscape and Conservation, as stated within SODC’s own formal Pre-Application advice letter.</p>	<p>The purpose of the pre-application advice was to further guide and support the parish council in preparing the neighbourhood development order, in accordance with the council’s ‘duty to support’ requirements.</p>



Theme (no of responders commenting on this theme)	Illustrative Comments	Parish Council/Steering Group Response
	<p>Specifically, the Planning officer indicates that an NDO proposal such as ours has never occurred before in the county and is also unheard of to the best of their knowledge in the entirety of the whole country.</p> <p>Further, the council officer responsible for Landscapes, provides numerous specific reasons as to why the proposed NDO development is inappropriate for Clifton Hampden, not least the severe disruption to a number of key views over what are currently open spaces, that would be permanently adversely affected. Indeed the NDO as proposed – in terms of the number, location and design of the 17-new houses, are themselves considered highly incongruous to the existing look, feel and settings within the Parish. The Officers’ advice is explicit that the NDO proposed does not meet a number of defined policies, for example STRAT 6 (Green Belt). Further examples where the NDO is called into question relate to DES2 (Enhancing Local Character), ENV6 (Historic Environment) and ENV8 (Conservation Areas), amongst others, the latter of which the Council have a statutory duty to preserve and enhance.</p> <p>It was recommended by the SODC Planning Officer that additional Pre Application advice (subsequent to the advice given in Feb ’22) should be sought before proceeding with this NDO submission, however, this has not occurred to my knowledge. Indeed, as alterations to the NDO scheme have occurred since February 2022, then without the recommended updated Pre-Application Advice, I feel that this leaves the community without independent, authoritative guidance on what we are now being requested to comment upon.</p> <p>SODC pre-application advice “• Housing Need - How would the development proposals ensure that it would meet local need? Would there need to be some form of legal agreement in place to ensure the proposed dwellings will meet a local need in perpetuity? Has a local connection mechanism been considered? Is the strength of the evidence of a need sufficiently robust to demonstrate a significant housing need?</p>	<p>There is no requirement to publish pre-application advice prior to an application being made. However the PC/SG decided to do so for transparency, and given the community led nature of this project.</p> <p>The pre-application advice covered a wide range of issues that needed to be addressed in the drafting of an NDO prior to statutory consultation, submission and independent examination.</p> <p>For example, the Planning Officer highlighted the lack of evidence as to why the NDO will meet defined policies, i.e. that the evidence needs to be provided. Examples of this are the Green Belt Assessment and Housing needs Analysis, both needed to demonstrate Very Special Circumstances. The evidence was provided in the Regulation 21 Consultation.</p> <p>Issues raised in the pre-application advice were addressed for the pre-submission version of the NDO, the subject of this Consultation Statement</p>

Theme (no of responders commenting on this theme)	Illustrative Comments	Parish Council/Steering Group Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Medical facilities - How would the proposed new homes secure the otherwise unobtainable delivery of the proposed new doctors surgery? Has the local CCG confirmed a need for a new surgery and are they satisfied a GP business would be in a position to operate it? What assurances can be provided in this respect? Who would go on to own the facility, including buildings and land on behalf of the community? How will it be managed and who by? These matters would need to be secured in an appropriate legal agreement.</li> <li>• Viability evidence – having regard to the above, I would advise viability evidence will be needed to demonstrate how the proposed new market dwellings will secure the delivery of the medical facility. How has the required number of market homes been balanced against harm to the Green Belt, delivering a local need, and securing the construction of new buildings? Is the number of proposed dwellings arrived at strictly necessary to meet local needs and deliver the community benefits?</li> <li>• Absence of alternatives - a robust site assessment will be required to demonstrate an absence of alternatives in the vicinity. In my opinion, this should consider the proposed use of two sites for development, noting the objectives of Green Belt described above. Could the use of one site achieve a better outcome or are two sites still required?"</li> </ul> <p>We note that SODC have not been able to provide any opinion in favour of special circumstances. In fact the conservation officer has concluded "there will undoubtedly be a change in the character of these sites and the contribution they make to the character and appearance of the conservation area, as a result of development".</p>	<p>SODC comments on the pre-submission version have been addressed in the submission version.</p> <p>The PC/SG view therefore is that the pre-application advice document has, in effect , been superseded by the responses of SODC and other statutory bodies to the Regulation 21 consultation, and that no further action regarding the pre-application advice is needed.</p>
Alternative Proposals (6)	<p>The Surgery should be on the Paddock site rather than being so close to the traffic lights, which will cause people to wait while patients turn into and out of the Surgery.</p> <p>Other options seem far more sensible such as renovating and extending the existing surgery (across the large garden) retaining the current patient numbers or if a bigger surgery is required locating near the petrol station or the end of the Oxford Road.</p>	<p>The NDO SG considered a range of options for siting development, within the constraint of the two sites identified.</p>

Theme (no of responders commenting on this theme)	Illustrative Comments	Parish Council/Steering Group Response
	<p>There remains significant other development alternatives within the village that fulfill the needs of most of the NDO, without compromising the conservation area, and we wish they be considered at the earliest opportunity.</p> <p>The proposed benefits around housing and GP surgery will likely not be realised and even if benefits were deemed likely, alternative sites and locations in BCH could be found. There does not seem to have been much energy expended on finding locations for the proposed GP surgery or extra housing outside the historic village centre.</p> <p>If the surgery must be relocated, it should be moved outside the Conservation Area.</p> <p>Environmental concern: could be very easily prevented by development on brown field sites</p>	<p>Development outside these sites was not considered, for the reasons set out under Site Selection.</p> <p>The Informal Consultation was based on an initial design.</p> <p>In the Informal Consultation, some residents suggest significant changes to the layout, including a wholesale shift of the allotments development to the west side of the site.</p> <p>The resultant design, the move of the burial ground from the allotments to the paddock site, results from the analysis of comments received, which included alternative proposals, and is the best solution possible taking account of the many competing opinions.</p> <p>No changes to the NDO or supporting documentation have been made in respect of the matters raised.</p>
Mitigations (1)	<p>Mitigation if the vote is in favour of development</p> <p>If the vote is ultimately in favour of this development I request that the following are put in place prior to any spade entering the ground:</p>	PC/SG response to the requested mitigations:

Theme (no of responders commenting on this theme)	Illustrative Comments	Parish Council/Steering Group Response
	<p>1) Formal commitment is provided by both CHS, Developers, Owners and the Primary Care Network in a legally binding document, to hold everyone to account for the completion, transfer of assets, and future mobilisation of the surgery</p> <p>2) A clear strategy and sustainable business plan is drawn up, as to how the land transferred into the custody of the Community Land Trust, will be maintained and financially resourced for at least a period of 10 years.</p> <p>3) Ensure any development does not negatively impact on nocturnal wildlife, and neighbouring residents, due to inappropriate lighting and noise that is not in keeping with our dark night skies and quiet spaces.</p> <p>4) A suitable legal protection option is sought to safeguard any further encroachment of the conservation area in and around the village, including the North end of the allotment site.</p>	<p>Formal commitment, in the form of a S106 agreement, will be signed by all parties prior to work commencing.</p> <p>Once final agreement has been reached on the transfer of assets to the CLT, a strategy and business plan will be drawn up. If the CLT trustees are not satisfied that the plan is sustainable, they will not sign the S106 agreement.</p> <p>The mitigations and enhancements outlined in the Ecology Report will be provided.</p> <p>The PC/SG hold the view that ownership of land is a significant factor in preventing, or promoting development on it. Put most simply, development cannot occur without the landowner's agreement. A benefit of the NDO is that any undeveloped land on both sites that is undeveloped will pass into ownership of the Community Land Trust. Any development proposals brought forward by the CLT will be subject to the same policies and processes as any other proposal. All eligible residents of the parish may join the CLT and elect trustees, thereby influence decisions about future development.</p>

Theme (no of responders commenting on this theme)	Illustrative Comments	Parish Council/Steering Group Response