

**BRIGHTWELL CUM SOTWELL
PARISH NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN 2016-2032
CONSULTATION REPORT**

February 2017

**Brightwell cum Sotwell
Neighbourhood Plan**



Brightwell cum Sotwell Neighbourhood Plan 2016 – 2032

Consultation Report

February 2017

Contents

1. Introduction.....	3
1.1 Background.....	3
1.2 Neighbourhood Plan Community Consultation	4
2. Pre-Submission Public Consultation.....	5
2.1 Response from public.....	6
2.2 Response from Statutory Bodies.....	6
3. Overview of Pre-Submission Consultation Response.....	6
3.1 Summary.....	6
3.2 Changes to the Plan.....	6
4. List of Policies for the Pre-submission Draft Plan and the Submission Plan.....	7
5. Pre-Submission Public Consultation results.....	8
5.1 Analysis.....	8
5.2 Plan Response.....	8
5.3 Public Consultation Matrix.....	9
Appendix A Responses from Statutory Bodies.....	87
Appendix B Copy of leaflet.....	116
Appendix C Copy of BcS advertising the pre-submission consultation process.....	117

1.0 Introduction

This Consultation Report:

- gives a background to the formation of the Neighbourhood Plan
- summarises the consultation history; and
- describes the Regulation 14 (pre-submission) consultation process, the responses received, and consequent changes to the Plan.

1.1 Background

The decision to prepare a neighbourhood plan was taken by Brightwell cum Sotwell Parish Council and agreed at the Parish Meeting in spring 2013. A steering group for this project was formed by Brightwell cum Sotwell Parish Council in the winter of 2013. Steering group members are volunteers with a broad mix of skills and experience. Several members of the group are also parish councillors.

The parish council submitted its application to South Oxfordshire District Council to designate the area to be covered by the BCS Neighbourhood Development Plan in 2014. A decision from SODC was delayed due to an issue concerning Slade End Fields to the east of the parish that had recently been designated in the local plan as a site for the development of 555 houses. It was proposed to transfer this land from Brightwell cum Sotwell parish to be included in Wallingford under the Boundary Commission changes 2015. The NP area was agreed in 2015.

In August 2014, the Brightwell cum Sotwell Community Led Parish Plan was published. This plan followed two years of intensive community consultation that had been designed from the outset so that it could provide a strong evidence base for the neighbourhood plan. The 2014 Community Led Parish Plan updated the 2004 Vital Villages report – one of the first community led plans in the UK. The 2014 Community Led Parish Plan set out to define what is special about Brightwell cum Sotwell - who lives in the parish, why people live in the parish, what is valued about living in the parish and what would be changed. In essence it was a statement of how the parish viewed itself in 2014 and how parishioners would like to see Brightwell cum Sotwell evolve over the next ten years. To inform the plan, a two year process of consultation was undertaken. Parishioners were asked to have their say about what their priorities were, what they liked about living here and what would they improve. This included a doorstep survey of every household in the parish 'Have your Say' survey, drop-in sessions and pop up displays at numerous local events.

Eight working groups were established to investigate specific topics including: community and facilities; business and economy; crime and safety; young people; landscape and built heritage; wildlife; sustainability; and housing.

In October 2013 every adult over the age of 16 was offered the opportunity to fill in a detailed Parish Questionnaire. This included 143 separate questions and was used as evidence to inform the report. Younger people were targeted at a series of special events. In total 64% of households completed and returned the Parish Questionnaire. In addition, 130 young people either completed a Have Your Say form or returned their Parish Questionnaire.

1.2 Neighbourhood Plan Community Consultation

The Parish Plan established the general principles for the neighbourhood plan to follow. It identified the general needs of the community and the wider issues such as landscape, facilities, views and heritage which are important and should be accounted for in the neighbourhood plan. The Community Led Parish Plan included a comprehensive action plan for delivery. Action BCS 1 concerned the BCS Neighbourhood Plan setting out the issues that should be addressed. The 2014 Community Led Parish Plan also included an updated Village Design Statement. The general nature

of this report, and the quality of the consultation process was such that the sub group has used it as a key part of the evidence base for this Plan.

The neighbourhood plan is a community project, and must derive its authority and policies from the community. Communication, feedback and consultation have played a major part in developing our Plan. The consultation process included:

- The steering group meeting monthly
- Minutes of these meetings being available on the parish council website
- Updates were provided in the village magazine and on the village Facebook page
- One to one meetings with interested groups, landowners who contacted the Parish Council and residents
- Updates to the Parish Council and the steering group
- Stalls at village events such as the annual fete
- Public workshops to establish design principles and community views on where development should go
- Leaflet drop to every household in the village with an opportunity to have their say by post or email
- Special public meetings – some of which have been attended by over 150 local residents
- Poster campaign on village notice boards and telegraph poles

As the draft neighbourhood plan progressed, the frequency of public meetings increased in order to gauge community responses to draft policies and site allocation.



Photo: Consultation meeting in the village hall 4th October 2017

In addition, three important projects were undertaken to provide additional evidence needed for the Plan.

In 2015, an independent Housing Needs Survey was commissioned by the parish council and carried out by Oxfordshire Rural Community Council. The Housing Needs Survey provided opportunities for respondents to make general comments and answer questions designed to help establish priorities for the Plan whilst testing some of the key findings assumed by the Parish Plan 2014. The results were then independently analysed and made available to the parish council.

A Landscape and Green Spaces Study was carried out by the sub-group. This short report included a desk top review of the findings of the Village Design Statement, the BCS Conservation Area Character Appraisal and appropriate landscape reports. It also used the findings of the Community

Led Parish Plan and feedback from workshops / meetings / leaflet drops that had been carried out to inform the neighbourhood plan.

A Site Assessment Report was carried out to provide a summary of site assessments for background information and input in to the spatial and housing allocation policies for the Brightwell cum Sotwell Neighbourhood Plan (BPNP).

A planning consultant (Neil Homer, Planning Director RCOH Ltd), who has extensive experience in preparing neighbourhood plans, was appointed to guide the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group.

2.0 Pre-Submission Public Consultation

The pre-submission report and its supporting evidence was made available on the parish council website with links to this site on the parish website and Facebook page. Posters were placed around the village advertising the public consultation which ran from 9am Wednesday 23rd November until 9am Wednesday 11th January ie a period of 7 weeks which extended the statutory period by 1 week to allow for the Christmas period. Every household in the village was leafleted to inform them on how to have their say and a page was dedicated to the Pre Submission period in the Village parish magazine.

To allow for those without access to the web, printed copies were made available at a number of accessible locations, namely Brightwell Village Stores, The Red Lion Pub, Shillingford Bridge Hotel, and from the Parish Office by appointment with the Parish Clerk .

Two drop in sessions for residents were held at St Agatha's church rooms on Saturday 10th December from 2pm to 4pm and Wednesday 14th December from 7pm to 9pm. This was to give the opportunity to have a one to one meeting with a member of the steering group.

Comments were able to be submitted online or on paper addressed to the Parish Clerk who carefully logged them.

In addition to the above general invitation for the residents to make comments, notification was also given by email to potentially affected landowners and known interested parties. In some instances notification of the consultation period was attached in a plastic sleeve to a farm gate where the land owner was not known or posted if the email address was uncertain.

At the same time, the parish council consulted with the following statutory bodies identified in the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 including:

- South Oxfordshire District Council
- Oxfordshire County Council
- Environment Agency
- Natural England
- Historic England
- Thames Water

Also the following neighbouring parishes:

- Cholsey
- North Moreton
- Long Wittenham
- Little Wittenham
- Dorchester

- Warborough
- Benson
- Wallingford Town Council
- South Moreton
- Crowmarsh

2.1 Response from Public

In response to the public consultation, a total of 42 comments were received online or paper copy. Many were signalling their overall support, some with particular comments or concerns relating to identified sites and some suggesting changes to the wording of certain policies.

Comments relating to the inclusion of additional and/or replacement sites were received, principally from those with a declared interest in the sites that had not been included.

2.2 Responses from Statutory Bodies

Material responses were received from the following which are included in Appendix A:

- South Oxfordshire District Council
- Historic England
- Natural England
- Environment Agency
- Oxfordshire County Council (received after closing date)

No responses were received from the neighbouring parishes.

3.0 Overview of Pre-Submission Consultation Response

3.1 Summary

A complete list of the pre-submission responses, together with the replies of the Neighbourhood Plan steering group. Is provided in the Public Consultation Matrix below. The following key messages were identified:

The vast majority of the parishioners recognised the need for development and supported the production of a Neighbourhood Plan.

Where changes were proposed to the policies they were generally to strengthen the protection of the environment and character of the village or, if relating to a particular site, the details of how the site might be developed to reduce the impact on the existing residents. This was particularly evident in relation to the proposals at Slade End Green.

There were some suggested changes to the Proposed Village development boundary which were primarily aimed at allowing for the inclusion of three additional sites, Rectory Meadows, Five Acres and land at Sotwell Fruit Farm.

The statutory bodies raised no overall objections to the Plan although SODC did make some suggested changes to the text of the policies as well as raising some technical issues related to the proposed development boundary. These were discussed with SODC and incorporated into the Submission Plan which is understood will be able to meet the Basic Conditions.

Comments received from OCC are dated 30 January and arrived too late to be properly considered by the steering group. However, the comments will be taken into account where possible including when specific site development plans are considered.

3.2 Changes to the Plan

In consideration of the comments received from the public consultation a number of changes were made to the wording of the Pre-Submission Draft. These were done to clarify points and incorporate changes that were felt to strengthen the Plan in accordance with the comments received, in particular those from SODC who gave much helpful advice through discussion and e mail exchanges.

It may be noted that this led to some changes in the order and titles of the policies.

- The pre-submission Policy BCS1 A Spatial Plan for the Parish has been renamed Brightwell cum Sotwell Village Boundary.
- The pre-submission Policy BCS 6 Landscape Character has been divided in to two sections BCS6 Local Gaps and BCS7 Landscape Character and the Villages
- The pre-submission Policy BCS12 has been renamed and modified to include Biodiversity in its title to reflect the comments from Natural England.
- The pre-submission Policy BCS BCS13 Horticulture was removed as it did not add anything not covered by the SODC Local Plan and/or NPPF.
- The pre-submission Policies BCS15 Tourism Facility, BCS16 Natural Burial Ground and BCS17 Community Facilities were reordered.

The following table gives the policies in both the draft pre-submission plan and the final submission plan. It should be noted that any comments received during the consultation period related to the pre-submission policies and it is these that are referenced in the consultation matrix.

4.0 List of Policies for the Pre-submission Draft Plan and the Submission Plan

Pre-submission Draft Plan Policies		Submission Plan Policies	
BCS1	A Spatial Plan for the Parish	BCS1	Brightwell cum Sotwell Village Boundary
BCS2	Land at Bosley's Orchard	BCS2	Land at Bosley's Orchard
BCS3	Land at Little Martins & Home Farm Barns	BCS3	Land at Little Martins & Home Farm Barns
BCS4	Land at Thorne's Nursery	BCS4	Land at Thorne's Nursery
BCS5	Slade End Green - Slade End Farm - Strange's Nursery - Slade End South to West of Green Lane	BCS5	Slade End Green - Slade End Farm - Strange's Nursery - Slade End South to West of Green Lane
BCS6	Landscape Character	BCS6	Local Gaps

BCS7	The Green Heart	BCS7	Landscape Character and the Villages
BCS8	Design Principles in the Parish	BCS8	The Green Heart
BCS9	Design Principles in the Conservation Areas & their Settings	BCS9	Design Principles in the Parish
BCS10	Local Green Spaces	BCS10	Design Principles in the Conservation Areas & their Settings
BCS11	Trees, Hedgerows & Wildlife Corridors	BCS11	Local Green Spaces
BCS12	Footpaths & Bridleways	BCS12	Biodiversity, Trees, Hedgerows & Wildlife Corridors
BCS13	Horticulture	BCS13	Footpaths & Bridleways
BCS14	Solar Energy	BCS14	Renewable Energy
BCS15	Tourism Facility	BCS15	Community Facilities
BCS16	Natural Burial Ground	BCS16	Tourism Facilities
BCS17	Community Facilities	BCS17	Natural Burial Ground

5.0 Pre-Submission Public Consultation results

5.1 Analysis

- Every comment received was logged by the Parish Clerk.
- Feedback was discussed in detail at meetings held by the Steering Group held on 16th and 23rd January. Further discussion was had with SODC and OCC.
- Details of the public comments together with the responses of the Steering Group were collated into the Public Consultation matrix below.

5.2 Plan Response

- Comments such as those agreeing with a policy, a statement or other part of the Plan which are deemed to need no change to the Plan are marked as 'noted' in the right hand column of the matrix.
- Where comments resulted in changes to the text of the Plan the principal policies are noted.
- Where comments are made requesting a change to the Plan, and these have not been incorporated in to the updated Pre-Submission Plan, reference is made to the evidence base.
- The Final version of the Submission Neighbourhood Plan was approved by the Parish Council on 30th January 2017.
- A public meeting is to be held on 7th February 2017 in the village hall to explain the changes from the draft Submission Plan.

5.3 Public Consultation matrix			
ID number	Part of Pre submission plan. Figures in (x) indicate revised Policy number where different.	Comments Received	Steering Group Response
1a	General	Our overall concern is that the village may be developing into a series of enclaves with a number of houses in each of them. They may create their own informal groupings and connections and this may mitigate against a "village feeling"; it will be very important to ensure that the inhabitants of these enclaves feel part of the village and not just part of their immediate locality. It would be a tragedy if the village which has in the past been cohesive and friendly became segmented and distant	Agree with concerns and we have worked to provide the correct balance. Committee notes CLPP.
9a	General	Whilst I think it is disappointing that villages are constantly coming under pressure to increase their housing stock, I do appreciate the pressures that an increasing population pose. Therefore, the need to find additional sites for development is understandable. Interestingly, the Plan refers to "the Island Donkey Sanctuary and Sotwell Manor Fruit Farm are a reminder of the area's agricultural past" though, I understand that part of the fruit farm has recently been sold for a potential 150 dwelling development. I wonder whether the proposed development would enable the village to preserve some of the green spaces identified for development under this plan?	The plan achieves this.
11a	BcS8 (9)	Parish residents have clearly indicated a need for new housing to be restricted to smaller units for downsizing and / or starter homes. Are there robust constraints in terms of design, layout and sale conditions that can be applied to new dwellings to restrict extension and the creation of the larger dwellings the parish does not require	We have followed guidance from the Housing Needs Survey.

37a	General BcS1 BcS10 (11)	<p>1. Parish Neighbourhood Plan Chapter 5</p> <p>1.1 We fully support the vision and objectives. A minor change being in 5.2.6 to delete or qualify 'young' from 'young families'.</p> <p>1.2 Policies map and BCS1</p> <p>1.2.1 We very much support the classification, BCS10 Local Green Space, but feel it very important that as well as being applied to 6i and 6ii it is also used to classify the field adjacent and to the south of the Croft Path and the field to the south of Slade End adjacent to the A4130, effectively an extension of 6ii. Both these fields are part of the landscape character of the village; are intrinsic to the setting of the village; integral to views out of the village. The field to the south of Slade End equally contributes to the Slade End Gap as 6ii.</p> <p>1.2.2 We are concerned that by including within the settlement boundary the two properties immediately to the south of 5a that they are opened up for unintended development that would be counter to the vision set out for Slade End Green. We would urge that further consideration be given.</p> <p>1.2.3 On the map there are five examples where it appears land is in a conservation area but is also 'hatched' as it meets another classification. No reference is made in the key. It would be less ambiguous if this could be stated in the key.</p> <p>1.2.4 We very much support the statement in BCS1: 'The suitability of proposed access will be judged by the planning and highways authorities in the normal way.'</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Committee feels there is sufficient protection from Local and National Policy</p> <p>Noted. Inconsistent not to include it.</p> <p>Followed guidelines.</p> <p>Noted</p>
4a	BcS6	<p>Whilst we accept provision has to be made for certain amount of development, by way of additional housing within the village; it is important that the village envelope is retained as much as possible, this will maintain the green spaces and avoid merging with the town Wallingford.</p>	<p>Noted</p>

15a	Landscape policies	<p>Landscape Policies (p28)</p> <p>The first full paragraph on p28 ends with the sentence “In this way the A4130 does not form an artificial and hard edge to the settlement.” I would like to see this strengthened and extended as follows (additional wording in bold type): “In this way the A4130 does not form an artificial and hard edge to the settlement and for this reason the fields on the south side of the A4130 are not considered appropriate sites for further housing development.”</p>	Agreed see evidence in Landscape and Green Spaces Strategy.
38a	General BcS1	<p>The overall spatial plan for the village is simply a proposed settlement edge to the village with the intended aim to define the village boundary to distinguish between the built up area of the main village and the surrounding countryside.</p> <p>The Local Plan Policies map does not define a development boundary for the Village, it is proposed to include a Village Boundary in the Neighbourhood Plan in order to provide clarity for those proposing development schemes.</p> <p>The alignment of the Village Boundary as proposed however omits various portions of land which could be developed in accordance with the vision and objectives of the Neighbourhood Plan, notable the Land at Five Acres, which is outside of the AONB, south of the High Road, outside of the conservation area, is, non-productive horticultural land and does not build on village green spaces.</p> <p>It is clear that the land at Five Acres does not form a component of the countryside surrounding the village by virtue of its location south of the High Road, and as it is encircled by village development to the south and west and further to the east at Slade End.</p> <p>A review of the evolving historical development pattern as shown on Ordnance Survey Maps from 1877 to 2016 highlights that the</p>	Comments noted please to refer Neighbourhood Plan Evidence Base

		<p>land at Five Acres forms a rational extension to the linear village, contained within the bounds of the High Road and Slade End to the east. The inclusion of the land at Five Acres, echoes the development of Greenmere and Kings Orchard south of the High Road.</p> <p>The existing village form wraps around the western, southern and eastern sides of the land at Five Acres, with the northern boundary of the site defined by the High Road. The proposed Village Boundary seemingly ignores the existing spatial pattern of the village, which joins the High Road at Slade End and immediately to the west of Five Acres.</p> <p>As such it is considered that the proposed Spatial Plan and associated Village Boundary is inconsistent with the objectives of the Neighbourhood Plan, in particular the objectives of avoiding development in the AONB, the prolongation of the village, the use of non-productive land and the protection of the conservation area. The land at Five Acres in particular has the ability to provide much needed housing to sustain existing services and facilities and to provide accessible housing to young families and the elderly. It is therefore considered that the current proposed settlement boundary is both counter to the objectives of the neighbourhood plan and the principles of sustainable development.</p>	
--	--	---	--

19a	General	<p>10/01/2017 I have just discovered that the minutes of the neighbourhood plan meetings have just been put online . Back in April 2016 the Old Orchard site has been selected and discussions were going on with the developer. This is clearly unacceptable and confirms my fear that the matter has not been dealt with in the correct way.</p>	<p>It was discussed but not selected as the developer had presented plans at an open meeting of the Parish Council.</p>
-----	---------	--	---

39a	General	I would like to see 1 or 2 mini roundabouts off the main road to make it better to get out of the village, as with 60 more houses it will mean 60 or more cars in the village, and mini ones do not make it a problem for big lorries.	Down to OCC to approve, there would be many issues such as cost and also lighting and so would go against other aspects of the NP objectives.
13a	BcS8 (9)	<p>Whilst many may consider pavements to be urban in character, we believe them to be an important safety feature and their function overrides any aesthetic objection that some may have. Inevitably, vehicles will be parked at the side of a road and in the absence of a pavement pedestrians are forced to walk in the centre of the road; this is not safe, particularly for young children and the elderly. The majority of existing roadways in Brightwell-cum-Sotwell have pavements and we would argue that they should be included in any new development.</p> <p>We are very concerned at the impact an additional 130 cars will have on a village that has, effectively, mostly single track lanes and from which it is already difficult to exit onto the A4130 at busy periods, given that this road will be getting considerably busier with the planned 550 new homes at Site B Wallingford. In our view there should be two new roundabouts; one at the junction of the Dicot Road with the A4130 near Frog's Island and the other at the junction of the High Road with the A4130 near Style Acre. We understand that Oxfordshire Highways have already ruled this out but it is our belief that not enough priority is being given to infrastructure to support this new housing. These things should be made a condition of new development, rather than a reaction to it at a much later date.</p>	<p>Comments noted - each planning application will be considered on its merits.</p> <p>Down to OCC to approve, there would be many issues such as cost and also lighting and so would go against other aspects of the NP objectives.</p>

37b	BcS5a	8.1 BCS5A, 8.11 and point 18 of the non technical summary: assessment of sustainability objectives landscape: we believe that the 0/- rating should be changed to +. The current asbestos roofed and dilapidated buildings visible from public footpaths have a negative impact on the landscape therefore replacing these buildings with buildings that are sympathetic to the vernacular and surrounding landscape can only be positive.	Noted
6a	BcS5	I have read through the neighbourhood plan, and I note that building is being considered on Stranges nursery. Please be aware that I have observed stag beetle (in season) on the edge of the nursery along the croft path. I am sure you are aware that these are a protected species. I hope that consideration would be given to preserve their habitat, as they are now sadly regarded as seriously threatened through loss of habitat.	Noted – we are aware of the stag beetles and their protection

41a	BcS5	Access to and from the A4130 from the Slade End end of the village is difficult both because of the volume of Wallingford – Didcot traffic and, more particularly, because of the sharp bend at the point where Slade Ends turns up towards the main road. Every resident of Slade Ends has experienced heart-stopping moments on this corner, even when slowing to a crawl in anticipation, and a significant increase in traffic volume would make the problem much worse. So I would like to suggest that a maximum suggested number of houses for the three sites at Slade End should be included in the NP (as it has been for other suggested sites in the village). In my view, ten or twelve housing units (of whatever kind) would be the most that the three sites could support, given the problems mentioned above.	Agreed. Number has been clarified.
41b	BcS5	Two of the proposed development sites, BCS5b and BCS5c, can only be accessed via Green Lane. However the third site on Slade End Farm (BCS5a) could be accessed by the already existing road on Slade End Farm itself (the road that was used to access the original farm buildings and out-buildings now being proposed for housing development). I am	A master plan coordinated by the Neighbourhood Plan steering group will consider these comments as detailed plans are developed.

		<p>of course aware that this is a private road, but it is the owner who is proposing to develop the site and, like anybody else who wishes to develop the land on which their homes stand, the inconvenience caused by access requirements should be accepted, where possible, by the landowner/developer.</p> <p>If the proposed development at Slade End Farm were to use its own access road, then the overall burden of the development of Slade End's three sites would be shared rather than falling entirely on Green Lane.</p>	
41c	BcS5	<p>Green Lane itself is single track, very narrow in places and has a dangerous exit onto Sotwell Street ('blind' to the right). In my view it can support a small number of additional houses on sites BCS5b and BCS5c, but not the total traffic burden of all three sites including as many as sixteen housing units which, we are led to understand, are likely to be proposed for the Slade End Farm site at BCS5a.</p>	<p>A master plan coordinated by the Neighbourhood Plan steering group will consider these comments as detailed plans are developed. OCC Highways will have to be consulted.</p>
40a	BcS5	<p>My chief concern is the dangerous exit at the top of Green Lane into Slade End Road. To the right there is no sight line until a driver puts the front end of the car into Slade End road and leans forward to peer behind the wall of Triangle Cottage running alongside the road. The danger with this manoeuvre is that cyclist and cars coming into the village are not aware of the hidden exit and travel at some speed close to their left while at the same time a car exiting cannot see them. There have been several near misses by cars currently exiting the lane. In addition the lane is single track with no passing places.</p> <p>In view of these factors I feel it would be wiser for the Slade End Farm development cars to use the original concrete road which leads into the farm development site. This would leave Green Lane to support potentially 9 new homes, 6 on Strange's nursery site, 1 on the small triangle of land beyond it and 2 on the other side of the road replacing the old scout hut and derelict cottage which would be part of the Slade Farm development. It is also a possibility that more houses could be built on what are very large gardens at the bottom of the lane though at the moment there are no fixed plans to do this.</p> <p>Section BCS5A – Slade End Farm, point vi. States <i>'There is satisfactory</i></p>	<p>A master plan coordinated by the Neighbourhood Plan steering group will consider these comments as detailed plans are developed. OCC Highways will have to be consulted</p>

		<i>vehicular access</i> '. This statement is only true if the current Slade End Farm road is used for access; it is not true if the current Slade End Farm road is used for access as is confirmed under BCS 10a Factor 2: ' <i>Access is difficult to the site although there are two separate roads that could be used.</i> ' With regards to the Strange's Nursery site, BCS5B states that ' <i>Several applications have been refused due to access</i> '	
40b	BcS5	Under BCS5A Slade End Farm, there is no mention of a ' <i>financial contribution</i> ' to the improvements of Green Lane which implies that Green Lane will not be the access to the Slade End Farm development since both of the sites on Green Lane have been required to make such a contribution. Even if Green Lane is not the access to the Slade End Farm development, two of the houses, those replacing the derelict cottage and the old scout hut, may have access onto Green Lane and if this is the case a contribution should be required.	A master plan coordinated by the Neighbourhood Plan steering group will consider these comments as detailed plans are developed. OCC Highways will have to be consulted
40c	BcS5	My final point is again in relation to a proviso which has been applied to the other Slade End sites but not to the Slade End Farm site. This is the specification of a maximum number of houses to be built. It is very important that this be clarified since there are elements mentioned in the description of the development, in addition to the houses, such as business use, tourist use and leisure use. It is important that the total number of car and van movements is limited from the site since the Slade End road has a very dangerous, single-lane, right-angled bend on it as cars leave the village.	Agreed – number of houses is clarified.
42a	BcS5	We feel that the NP should indicate a suggested maximum number of homes for the proposed development site at Slade End Farm (BCS5A) as it has done for the proposed sites at BCS5b and 5c. This would mean that there would then be a proposed maximum number of new homes for Slade End – as there is for every other proposed development site in the village.	Agreed – number of houses is clarified
42b	BcS5	We have no objections to the development of the two proposed sites on the West side of Green Lane (BCS5b and BCS5c) – providing that Green Lane is not overburdened by the increased traffic generated. The total number of seven new homes suggested for these two sites seems	A master plan coordinated by the Neighbourhood Plan steering group will consider these comments as detailed plans are developed.

		to us the maximum that Green Lane can bear if it is to remain a safe and convenient access road for existing residents.	OCC Highways will have to be consulted
42c	BcS5	<p>We have concerns about the development of the third site – BCS5a – at Slade End Farm. The owners of Slade End Farm have kindly shared with us their early thoughts and plans for a development of perhaps 16 housing units (of different kinds) with the possible addition of a leisure or fitness facility at a later date. Overall we feel that the plans are considerably thought out and potentially attractive addition to the village. We are particularly pleased that the development is being planned, and may well be executed, by people who clearly care about the village rather than by a developer with no connections to Brightwell-cum-Sotwell.</p> <p>Our concerns are these:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The existing residents unanimously feel that access to the proposed development of site BCS5a (Slade End Farm) should not be via Green Lane but via Slade Ends Farm’s own existing access road. At the moment the NP implies, but does not state, that access would be via Green Lane. We request that this be changed. This would mean that the access load to the three sites at Slade End would be shared rather than the whole burden of access being borne by Green Lane. The farm out-buildings to be developed were originally accessed via Slade End Farm’s own existing access road and we feel this should continue to be the case. May we also point out that the NP does specifically state that Green Lane should be preserved as a traditional village lane with grass verges, scrub areas and no pavements or street lighting; we feel that this aim is incompatible with the use of the lane to access all three of the proposed housing development sites at Slade End. b) The exit from single-track Green Lane onto Sotwell Street is ‘blind’ to the right. This is our only exit and, with care it is manageable at the moment, but none of us wants to see a big increase in traffic on a narrow exit where two cars cannot pass. 	<p>A master plan coordinated by the Neighbourhood Plan steering group will consider these comments as detailed plans are developed.</p> <p>OCC Highways will have to be consulted</p> <p>Agreed – number of houses needs to be specified.</p>

		<p>c) The proposals for the site BCS5a are much vaguer than for the other development sites featured in the NP: they indicate no suggested total number of housing units and make mention of additional 'business premises', 'tourist accommodation' and 'communal buildings'. We feel that this is too open-ended and are naturally concerned that the long term result may be a significant increase in development and in the resulting traffic and access problems.</p>	
42d	BcS5	<p>Like many other residents of Slade End, we are concerned that the total number of housing units on the three sites is too many and that the traffic generated would add to the existing difficulties of entering and leaving the village to the A4130. To leave Slade End means using Sotwell Street which narrows to one-way in several places and has a particularly narrow and dangerous bend as it turns up towards the A4130; there is scarcely a resident who has not had a near miss at this bend and, while recognising the real need for new housing, we do not want to see this danger increased.</p>	<p>The housing numbers needs to be specified. A master plan coordinated by the Neighbourhood Plan steering group will consider these comments as detailed plans are developed. OCC Highways will have to be consulted</p>
7a	BcS5	<p>Para 2 - This has never been known as Green Lane and in my 60 years + memory has only ever been known as The Lane.</p> <p>Para 4 –'The strip of land between the redundant farm yard and Green Lane includes scrub and several derelict cottages and a former scout hut'</p> <p>This statement is completely inaccurate. The strip of land referred to only ever had two semidetached wooden bungalows which were used by farm workers and a large slurry pit at the southern end. When the workers were re-housed, the two bungalows were converted into a single building for use as a Scout Hut. On the Green opposite Triangle Cottage there was a long open fronted stone and timber cart shed and some of the stone wall from this structure is still in evidence.</p> <p>The issues of construction traffic , and vehicular access and egress are covered in the joint submission from Slade End residents.</p>	<p>Name has been used for identification purposes only.</p> <p>Thank you – noted.</p>

	<p>General comments concerning Slade End</p> <p>Today (07.01.17) we met with Adrian and Alison to try and understand their vision for Slade End Farm. They were reluctant to talk in terms on any certainty but suggested that the following represents their current thinking:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · 2 detached houses or possibly two semi detached houses to be constructed on the strip of land to the east of The Lane · 8 house retirement complex · 6 short term rental business/recreational units. · A spa to include a 25 metre swimming pool, a gym and associated rooms and facilities. This for use by the family and residents of the site and also for villagers and others – for fee. · They would like to buy the old nursery site (six houses) and also the small triangular site on the west of The Lane and plan and develop all sites as a single development. They are in talks with the owner of the old nursery · All traffic will use The Lane for construction and subsequent access and egress. They would not contemplate any traffic using their own existing access (opposite Coombe House) or to negotiate with the land owner use of the concrete road just beyond his southern boundary. · They stressed that the plan they showed us was only one of multiple iterations and their plans could well change · All dwellings they build on the site will be for rental only because they wish to retain ownership of the land. · There are no firm plans or timescales. <p>In view of the foregoing, I do not believe that any of the Slade End Farm developments should be included in the Neighbourhood Plan in that there is zero certainty as to what the plans are. If it is included you are</p>	<p>Agreed – the number of houses will be specified. A master plan coordinated by the Neighbourhood Plan steering group will consider these comments as detailed plans are developed. OCC Highways will have to be consulted.</p>
--	---	--

		<p>effectively giving carte blanche to 23 dwellings which would produce a housing density inappropriate for a conservation area.</p> <p>In respect of the content in the Neighbourhood plan in relation to Slade End I cannot support it without further clarity in respect of dwelling volumes and traffic access</p>	
9b	BcS5	<p>My wife and I have lived in XXXXX for 20yrs and whilst we do not oppose some development of Slade End Green, we are really concerned by the potential over development of the site. For the other sites proposed, the Plan has made reference to the potential number of dwellings, I don't believe that it would be unrealistic for the Plan to reference a number for Slade End Green. At the second public meeting, whilst Jason would not be drawn on a number, the impression given was that 10-15 dwellings across the 3 sites wouldn't be unreasonable. At a recent meeting with Adrian Wood (owner of the Slade End Farm site), Adrian shared his potential plans for 16 dwellings on the Slade End Farm site alone. All these dwellings were expected to have access onto Green Lane.</p> <p>Our concerns with the Plan in respect to the Slade End Farm are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No restrictions on total number of dwellings could lead to a significant over development of the site. Even a development of 10-15 dwellings would significantly increase the current dwelling density around Green Lane / Slade End. 2. Green Lane is a single vehicle track with limited visibility from the right when accessing Sotwell Street and our concerns over safety are well documented. Increasing the number of dwellings accessing Green Lane will only heighten this issue further. We would like the Plan to explore options for the Slade End Farm development to use the current access at the side of Slade End House. 	<p>Agreed – the number of houses will be specified.</p> <p>A master plan coordinated by the Neighbourhood Plan steering group will consider these comments as detailed plans are developed.</p> <p>OCC Highways will have to be consulted</p>

11b	BcS5	<p>The lane referred to in the report as Green Lane currently serves six dwellings. This is an adopted lane but receives only sporadic and limited attention from the Highways Authority. The lane is prone to flooding after relatively small amounts of rain and is easily damaged by the refuse lorry and other heavy vehicles. It is difficult to see how the lane can be adequately upgraded to serve the significant increase in use by domestic cars and service vehicles resulting from all the proposed development without detracting from the rural "edge of settlement" character of the area. Any widening/upgrading work should be done in such a way as to discourage parking on the lane. The increase in traffic flow will also pose an increased risk to users of the Croft footpath. These issues could be mitigated by ensuring that all development at Slade End Farm is served by the existing farm access and is not routed down the lane.</p>	<p>Agreed – the number of houses will be specified. A master plan coordinated by the Neighbourhood Plan steering group will consider these comments as detailed plans are developed. OCC Highways will have to be consulted</p>
23a	BcS5	<p>There has now been two meeting with Adrian the last being Saturday, and it seems we are no closer to knowing what his plans are for the site although it now seems that he is considering purchasing all the sites on the Green Lane site for rental purpose as with Slade End Farm. With this in mind I think it should be added to Policy BCS5A /7 that access from the farm complex should be by way off the road that is there now and not by way off Green Lane, as you have for stipulated B&C of the Policy.</p>	<p>Agreed – the number of houses will be specified. A master plan coordinated by the Neighbourhood Plan steering group will consider these comments as detailed plans are developed. OCC Highways will have to be consulted.</p>
32a	BcS5	<p>These sites are envisioned by the Neighbourhood Plan to come forward under one masterplan, although they are in three separate land ownerships;</p> <p>BCS5A: Slade End Farm - dwellings (number of dwellings not indicated) and business use BCS5B: Stranges Nursery - 6 dwellings BCS5C: Slade End South to West of Green Lane - 1 dwelling</p> <p>The Plan acknowledges that these sites may take some time to come forward but no specific reason is given as to why this is. Legal</p>	<p>Agreed – the number of houses will be specified. A master plan coordinated by the Neighbourhood Plan steering group will consider these comments as detailed plans are developed. OCC Highways will have to be consulted</p>

		<p>agreements and land equalization are referenced and could be potential reasons for delay.</p> <p>Planning Practice Guidance advises on assessing sites and states 'Where constraints have been identified, the assessment should consider what action would be needed to remove them (along with when and how this could be undertaken and the likelihood of sites/broad locations being delivered). Actions might include the need for investment in new infrastructure, dealing with fragmented land ownership, environmental improvement, or a need to review development plan policy, which is currently constraining development.' (Reference ID: 3-022-20140306).</p> <p>The intention of Policy BCS5 is to bring these three sites forward together under one masterplan. However the assessment of the sites does not identify how and when the fragmented landownership will be dealt with and this has an impact on the availability of these site coming forward together.</p> <p>Site A falls within the Conservation area whilst site B and C lie adjacent. As identified within the site assessment, site B highlights that 'there have been several planning applications made since at least 1982 for housing which were refused for reasons including, in an appeal of 2003, impact on the conservation area'. With regards to site C, a planning application was made for one bungalow in 2013 which was refused at appeal for reasons including impact on the character and appearance of the area, in addition to the setting of the adjacent Conservation Area.</p> <p>Further to the above comments, the sustainability appraisal and specifically the scoring matrix for this site (p24) should be reconsidered to take account of the implications of development on heritage and rural character.</p>	
38b	BcS1 and BcS5	The land at Slade End comprises three portions (Slade End Farm, Strange's Nursery and Slade End South to West of Green Lane), each	Agreed – the number of houses will be specified.

		<p>within separate ownership. The Neighbourhood Plan intends that these three portions of land be developed via a single planning application or a masterplan covering all three sites. The intention is to recreate one of the original nuclei of the village. The draft Neighbourhood Plan acknowledges that land assembly is an impediment to these sites coming forward for development.</p> <p>The proposals for Slade End Farm does not specify a target number of dwellings, while Strange’s Nursery and Slade End South target six and one dwellings respectively. It would therefore appear that this site is not capable of delivering a meaningful number of units, particularly in the short term due to land assembly constraints.</p> <p>It is further noted that the land at Slade End is subject to surface water flooding, which will need to be resolved as part of any development.</p> <p>The land at Slade End furthermore abuts the Grade II listed cottages at Chapel Land and Slade End House, which has listed barns and Triangle Cottage. The site is furthermore constrained by areas of scrub which have established on derelict portions of the land.</p> <p>Access to the site is somewhat constrained by the narrow width of Green Lane which would have to be improved to permit development.</p> <p>The land at Slade end is furthermore located on the far eastern side of the village, far from the shops, post office, pub and school and bus stops and is therefore not located in a sustainable and accessible area.</p> <p>Due to potential flooding, land assembly constraints and potential ecological impacts, it is submitted that the Land at Slade End is less favourable for residential development and may not come forward during the plan period.</p>	<p>A master plan coordinated by the Neighbourhood Plan steering group will consider these comments as detailed plans are developed. OCC Highways will have to be consulted.</p> <p>Please see evidence base.</p>
37c	BcS5	1.3 BCS5	

	<p>1.3.1 We support the vision of Slade End Green recognising that the NHP Committee will need to be creative in working with land owners to determine what form and where a 'green' will be located. As the landowners of Slade End Farm we are very willing to play a part in working closely with the NHP Committee and other stakeholders to achieve this.</p> <p>1.3.2 There is an inconsistency in the language and therefore understanding of what is intended between policies BCS2/BCS3/BCS4 and BCS5.</p> <p>BCS2/BCS3/BCS4 are all 'allocated' where as for BCS5/BCS5A/BCS5B/BCS5C the NHP states that proposals 'will be supported'. We believe that 'will be supported' should be replaced with the wording 'is allocated'.</p> <p>1.3.3 We support BCS5A. In relation to vehicular access we agree with vi and recognise that this will be through the improvement of Green Lane as set out in vii and viii.</p> <p>1.3.4 We support the mixed use of housing and business use at Slade End Farm, and the economic and local employment benefit that tourist accommodation will bring to the parish. We believe this is in accordance with the Brightwell-cum-Sotwell Community Led Parish Plan 2014 and BCS15.</p> <p>1.3.5 Green Lane i) Green Lane is a County Council adopted highway from the junction with Slade End to a point in line with the southern boundary of Slade End Farm.</p> <p>ii) Green Lane serves as an access road for six currently occupied houses, a pumping station, Slade End South and occasional farm traffic.</p>	<p>As it is three different sites with 3 owners which requires a master plan appropriate language used.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>
--	---	---

	<p>In the past it also provided access for Slade End Nurseries (wholesale and retail), Slade End Farm (secondary access) and two bungalows/Scout hut.</p> <p>Therefore there is historic residual capacity.</p> <p>iii) The current formation of the junction of Green Lane with Slade End meets the County Council's minimum visibility criteria to the west, but does not meet minimum visibility criteria to the east.</p> <p>However the land between the boundary walls of Hillfoot and Triangle Cottage is owned by the Highways Authority, and so we believe it will be possible to realign the junction to meet the County's safety standards. We have commissioned a highways consultant, Huw Jones of HVJ Transport Ltd, on access and highways issues. Huw was previously a principal highways engineer at Oxfordshire County Council advising on highway issues within the districts of SODC, the Vale and the City of Oxford.</p> <p>Huw met with OCC Highways on site to examine the suitability of Green Lane as an access road for Slade End Farm. Together they defined the current visibility issue to the east but advised that there are a number of different solutions. Improving the junction visibility will be a benefit to all existing residents as well as new users of the lane. Huw Jones provided this statement:</p> <p>'The junction of Green Lane with Slade End (village road) could be realigned to improve visibility and meet the adequate and satisfactory standards for the appropriate sightlines for the speeds of vehicles. Green Lane could be further improved with a shared surface access-way with sensitive materials and design in keeping with the surrounding landscape and in accordance with the County Council's Design Guide for a rural lane'.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
--	--	--------------

	<p>iv) Since the time of the site inspection the Parish Council has announced that 'Oxfordshire County Council have now approved proposals for 20mph speed limits in Brightwell-cum-Sotwell.'</p> <p>v) The masterplan process for developing Slade End Green is a unique opportunity to identify the issues residents have with the lane and design the lane to practically meet at least the minimum highway standards. The developers of the Slade End Green sites would need to enter into a Section 278 Agreement with OCC Highways to ensure all standards are met.</p> <p>As the owners of Triangle Cottage which accesses from Green Lane we would support improvements to Green Lane.</p> <p>Green Lane is currently in poor maintenance condition and is of a low priority for the County Council.</p> <p>The highways authority own the verges. We are the owners of the eastern plots that are immediately adjacent to Green Lane and the wall at the eastern junction corner. Therefore the access issues can be overcome and delivered to enable all three Slade End Green sites to use Green Lane as the vehicular access road.</p> <p>1.3.6 Increase in traffic flows on Slade End The proposals of BCS5 are adding minimally to traffic generation based on TRICS data. The historic use of Slade End Farm as a pig and arable farm would have resulted in many more traffic movements.</p> <p>A planning application for Slade End Farm approved in 1993 for 5,000 square feet of light industrial use and associated vehicle movements would have had a far greater impact in terms of volumes of traffic and size of vehicles.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>All 3 landowners have now agreed the process.</p> <p>Part of master plan.</p> <p>Noted see above.</p>
--	--	---

	BcS6 (6&7)	<p>We estimate that approximately 190 houses currently use the Slade End access when travelling east of the village plus visitors to the village going to the pub and Free church.</p> <p>1.3.7 What will be the process for the agreement of a masterplan?</p> <p>1.4 BCS5C Currently on the site there is a large 'shed'. If this site is to be allocated for a single house then the shed should be demolished.</p> <p>1.5 BCS6 We very much support this policy. We believe that as per point 1.2 of this letter, the field to the south of Slade End equally contributes to the Slade End Gap as 6ii and should be included.</p>	
--	------------	---	--

35a	BcS2	My client supports the allocation of his site for residential development under policy BCS2 and wishes to assure the Parish Council that the land is available and looks forward to delivering a development that is both beneficial to the local community and of a standard that it will be proud of.	Noted
1b	BcS2	The access to the High Road will be a major problem. You have highlighted this in your Site Allocation Policies document. We will already be facing a vast increase in traffic along the A4130 from the Slade End development of 550 houses which will make entry onto that road increasingly difficult. The entry to the proposed development at Bosley's Orchard needs to be sited sufficiently far down the High Road from the junction with the A4130 to prevent accidents caused by cars leaving the A4130 and speeding around the blind corner down the High Road. We have first hand knowledge of how dangerous that bend already is.	<p>OCC Highways will be consulted in any planning application.</p> <p>Agreed</p>

		<p>It is, as you state, important to ensure the "preservation and enhancement of the rural landscape and sense of place" and to "retain existing trees and hedgerows and design new landscaping to conserve and enhance the established character" of the Parish. We are also concerned that the ancient hedgerow, those magnificent old oak trees and the many beech and ash trees to the east of Bosley's Orchard should be retained and believe that your idea of a buffer of a community orchard on the west side of the bridleway is a very good way to conserve the character of the area.</p> <p>You are right when you state in the NP that any development should "improve the quality and design of existing and new housing" and that "modern developments have tended to reduce the rural feel of the Parish". We are very concerned that the proposed design of the houses will not be in keeping with this aim and that the mass and monotonous feel of the development will detract from the rural aspect of this end of the village.</p> <p>Finally, the number of houses in the proposed development (you state "up to a maximum of 20 houses would be acceptable") will alter the approach to "a rural parish set within open countryside" (your words again). The Inspectors who have examined previous applications to build on Bosley's Orchard have remarked on the rural feel of this end of the village and the NP emphasises that any coalescence between Wallingford and the village is undesirable. The size of any development could adversely affect this end of the village unless it is substantially screened by trees and vegetation, existing and new.</p>	<p>This can only be considered through the planning application process.</p> <p>Noted</p>
3a	BcS2	<p>As advised by the letter sent to our house we have read the Pre-Submission Report and have only the following comment to make. On page 21 in the section on Bosley's Orchard point vii reads 'That the design and layout provides an appropriate buffer zone for properties along Bell Lane'. We just wonder whether the word 'appropriate' should be replaced with more specific detail as what a developer</p>	<p>Detailed application to consider.</p>

		considers 'appropriate' may be very different to what a resident of the village feels is appropriate. Perhaps as for the boundary on the other side a specific depth of buffer zone could be stated?	
15b	BcS2	Point (iv) requires that “The access scheme contains measures to improve safety for vehicular access turning into the site off the shallow bend on the High Road.” I believe this should be extended to cover measures to improve safety for vehicles coming out of the site on to the High Road, which I think has greater potential for an accident than vehicles turning into the site. Vehicles turning off the A4130 into the High Road could be travelling at up to 30 mph, for which the stopping distance in wet weather is 25 – 30 metres. Hence, the entry/exit point from the site on to the High Road should be at least this distance from the A4130.	Should be covered by OCC Highways at the application stage.
38c	BcS2	<p>This site is allocated for up to 20 dwellings and is situated south of the High Road entrance to the village, the site is contained within a high perimeter of trees and has been extensively colonised by scrub areas.</p> <p>The site is considered to be a well located portion of land, with good access to the village’s services and facilities, the Neighbourhood Plan calls for the site to deliver up to 20 homes, however this is considered to be difficult to achieve while maintaining a development form which is consistent with and complimentary to the development pattern of the village and retaining conservation worthy landscape elements such as green buffers and hedges.</p> <p>An application for planning permission for 13 dwellings has been submitted for this site, which is yet to be determined.</p> <p>The application for 13 dwellings represents a shortfall of 7 units to the proposed allocation, a shortfall which would need to be met on alternative sites or by allocating further land for housing.</p>	This reduction would not affect our minimum requirement.

12a	BcS1	I am concerned that there has been little evidence or substantiation given during the consultation process to the reasons for deselecting alternative sites for development around the village.	Please refer to evidence base.
32b	General	The Pre-Submission Neighbourhood Plan has failed to promote the principles of Sustainable Development, as explained in these representations, in allocating the following sites for residential development;	Please refer to evidence base.
	BcS3	BCS3 - 30 dwellings The site is accessed from a sharp corner on Didcot road and is therefore a reason for concern with regards to pedestrian and vehicular access.	
	BcS4	BCS4 - 4 dwellings Residential development on this site has previously been dismissed at appeal and the reasons given for vehicular access and impact on the conservation area still exist.	
	BcS5	BCS5a, b and c - 7 dwellings (excluding BCS5A) The Plan does not identify when and how these separate sites will come forward under one masterplan as intended.	
	BcS1	It is recommended that the Parish Council: 1) Extend the Village Boundary, indicated on the Pre-Submission policies map inset A, to include this site. 2) Include Sotwell Manor Fruit Farm as a residential allocation to meet the proposed housing need for Brightwell-Cum-Sotwell. This site is available and deliverable and represents the most sustainable option for development.	
19b	General	I understand that the process for compiling the document should be seen as democratic and transparent and that the public should be involved at every stage.	

	<p>Site Assessment Report</p>	<p>My main concern is the way the site selection for development was carried out. I have been studying the parish council minutes and it states in the July 2015 minutes “that the steering group were beginning to identify sites and mentions also that two developers have approached the committee”.</p> <p>In September 2016 the minutes state that the steering group have chosen sites and agreed allocation and that the residents affected would be given a private meeting, all this without any input from the village. The public meeting of the 4th October was advertised as introducing the potential sites to the village, various documents were used at the meeting and the public were told not to try to read them all word for word as they would all be out on line in the next few days. This was not the case and my feeling is that they were deliberately withheld, as I was fobbed off by the Chairman claiming that it was not an easy process converting the files used at the meeting from power point to pdf. The documents have only become available just prior to the start of the consultation period.</p> <p>On the 28th October 2016 I wrote to the Chairman asking very simple questions about the site selection process used and to this date I have received no answer only an acknowledgement from a third party some three weeks later. At the public meeting on the 2nd November we were told that the site selection was done and dusted and when I complained that the documents used were not made available to the public I was told I was too late. Other people at the meeting agreed with me that the documents had not been made available.</p> <p>The two main sites selected namely The Old Orchard and Little Martins both have developers interested and indeed I am told that both have had plans ready to submit for sometime. It appears that the steering group were guided to these sites because of this, for fear that if the sites were not selected the plans would be submitted to SODC anyway. Thorne’s nursery site has have been selected from what the chairman has stated at the public meeting so that the village hall car park can be extended, as confirmed in BcSS 04. This is not a sound reason to select</p>	<p>Noted. There were opportunities to comment throughout the development of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>
--	-------------------------------	--	---

	BcS13 (Policy deleted)	<p>the site. The land could be purchased without the need for houses. The site lies in the conservation area which is there to protect the listed buildings that surround the site.</p> <p>All the sites will put more traffic directly into the village which already is a nightmare to negotiate with the increasing numbers of parked cars on the roads and lanes as well as the longer queues at the exits. How long will it be before potential house buyers are put off by this dilemma? We have been told at various meetings about the presence of wildlife on Little Martins and Thorne’s nursery, this includes badgers, nesting kites and buzzards. Is the village so short of potential building sites that these creatures cannot be protected?</p> <p>I understand that the proposal is to have a village envelope re-instated around the village. This will only put more pressure on the green areas that are left in the village something that cannot be good for the quality of life for the villagers and wildlife.</p> <p>Item 4.4 states that the minutes of the monthly steering group meetings are available online, this is not the case, not even all the parish council minutes are available as October and November minutes for last year are absent. I note that under Green infrastructure and Biodiversity Policies it is stated that “Scrub is an important habitat in the village particularly on redundant nursery sites”, and yet you propose to develop on two of these sites. These can not be replaced quickly so wildlife will suffer. Policy BCS13 no iv needs clarification as it is too ambiguous at the moment.</p> <p>It is crucial that this process is community led and not seen as a process that the community just follows.</p>	<p>Policy has been amended in response to Natural England Comments</p> <p>Policy deleted</p>
--	------------------------	--	--

34a	General	Thank you for the opportunity to comment on your proposed	Noted. Text amended as
-----	---------	---	------------------------

	BcS3	<p>Neighbourhood Plan. We write to make comments on behalf of our client Kingerlee Homes who owns land at Brightwell-cum-Sotwell. Given that SODC has indicated a need to provide more housing than previous plans have provided and to provide that housing at a broader number of locations than in previous plans we are pleased the Parish Council has acknowledged the potential of Brightwell-cum-Sotwell as what might previously have been considered a smaller settlement to contribute to the district housing supply, and provide housing at a greater level than infilling alone could possibly allow. The level of development proposed in the plan will allow development to take place that will help to maintain the vitality of the village as a community.</p> <p>If additional homes are to be provided in the settlement suitable sites are required to its edges. We believe that a site like the one at Little Martins (policy site reference BCS3) can be provided in a sensitive manner with a considerable benefit to the sustainability and vitality of the village, in addition to housing supply for the district.</p> <p>Brightwell-cum-Sotwell presently benefits from a good range of facilities of its own, but that would be at risk if the village does not grow as there has been a trend towards smaller household sizes which effectively amounts to depopulation if new houses are not brought forward.</p> <p>We note that SODC had suggested proportional growth rates for smaller villages of 5% or 7.5% for medium villages. We are not aware of any evidence which suggests a greater level of growth would result in harm. We note that the NP reacts to that indicative proportional growth which we agree would be the minimum required to realise the objective of sustaining a vibrant rural community.</p> <p>Our client's site at Little Martins is excellently placed to deliver dwellings in a reasonably short-term to meet the district's housing need as well as local needs.</p>	appropriate.
--	------	--	--------------

		<p>The test for Neighbourhood Plans is different to local plans. The test of whether they should be made is whether or not it is appropriate to make the plan having regard to local and national policies and guidance. The plan does not have to be found sound in the sense that a Local Plan does.</p> <p>Considering the need for housing in the village we think that on the whole it strikes the right balance between the needs of the village and respecting and protecting the environment.</p> <p>Specifically in relation to the site at Little Martins it is not subject to any significant constraints, it is well related to services and facilities, and is readily deliverable.</p> <p>The site is obviously excellently located in relation to village facilities, in particular the arterial bus route to Didcot and Wallingford which passes along High Road to the north. The location is considered to be particularly suitable in the village as it minimises impact on designated assets and minimises disruption to the existing settlement. The site is not within the North Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty which covers land to the north of the village. Although it has housing on three sides, the site is also removed from the historic core of the settlement to the south limiting impact on built heritage and removing need for additional traffic on the narrow historic roads in this part of the village.</p> <p>The site is of a scale that would allow the including of much needed affordable housing and housing of a mix of type that is needed in the village.</p> <p>There also exists the potential to add significant public open space to the benefit of the whole village not just residents of the scheme.</p> <p>In relation to BCS3 we welcome its inclusion within the plan as the site has considerable merits that would render development there more</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>beneficial than harmful across a range of issues. Sustainable development is about making things better and not worse. There are no significant disadvantages from developing the site. It is not in a location that national policy would indicate it not be developed for instance.</p> <p>We have recently been undertaking a number of survey and reports on the site. None of these have led to the conclusion that the site should not be developed.</p> <p>The reports undertaken are to a high standard of professional work and would be suitable to accompany a full or outline planning application.</p> <p>Reports have covered the following subjects and can be provided if requested.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Landscape Visual Assessment - Arboricultural Impact <p>JPPC comments to BcSNP January 2017 for Kingerlee Homes 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Transport Assessment - Flood Risk Assessment - Archaeology - Heritage Assessment - Ecology/Biodiversity <p>Criterion v of the proposed policy BCS3 should be amended in our view. As a result of having undertaken the various reports suitable to allow a layout design for the site's development, we are concerned that the criterion is overly prescriptive in its present wording and following it to its letter may not produce the best overall development of a scheme for the quantum of housing suggested. It is possible to accommodate about 30 houses easily on the site and in doing so to provide a large amount of open space and also protect the corridor of Waterman's lane, however we think something other than a purely linear buffer would be appropriate and therefore we suggest that criterion v be more advisory and should say</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>The landscape scheme and layout provide for a wide buffer bordering Waterman’s lane (optimally 30m), to which pedestrian and cycle access provided</p> <p>We have consulted people on a version of a layout that included a narrower buffer at the southern end widening to a buffer of more like 60m at the northern end. This was well received when we met local people at the village hall event on 14TH December.</p> <p>Additionally we consider that the final clause of criterion vi ought to be removed. It is not within the control of the owner of BCS3 to provide access across the Old Nursery site (BCS4), therefore the policy requirement to provide a path should fall within policy BCS4 only.</p> <p>Criterion ix of BCS3 is sufficient for the purposes of robustness in relation to BCS3 as a standalone policy, and is not benefited by the double entry of the final clause of criterion vi.</p> <p>We would have no objection to providing a link through the site towards the village hall.</p>	
12b	BcS3 BcS12 (13)	<p>Further to the email concerning the proposed Neighbourhood Plan, I am keen to set out some points in this regard, relating to the specific site south of High Road and to the west of Watermans Lane. Specifically in relation to the site above, this would require a substantial alteration to the nature of the Right of Way, Watermans Lane and the existing surface would need to be modified to allow vehicular access. I also believe that allowing any alteration or access over Watermans Lane would set a dangerous and potentially harmful precedent which would then make the wholesale development of the existing field (bounded by Watermans Lane to the west) materially more likely. Any agreement to allow vehicular traffic into the site enables development to occur and any initial smaller planning application would I believe be followed by a revised application for much greater housing numbers once initial outline</p>	<p>There is a right of access to farm gate. The Neighbourhood Plan has considered this issue.</p>

		<p>permission was gained.</p> <p>The Parish Council's own planning policy (BCS12) states that there be no alteration in a Right of Way (Watermans Lane is specifically named) and any amendment to this Right of Way (including the construction of any road, including a tarmac surface) would be in direct contravention of the Parish's own policy.</p> <p>There are several mature trees guarded by Tree Preservation Orders at the southern end of Watermans Lane and I believe that access for vehicles could not be practically or safely made taking into account that these trees must be preserved.</p> <p>I would also draw your attention to the previous application (amongst others) dated 13th August 2008, (Reference P08/W0966), followed by appeal Reference APP/Q3115/A/09/2100727 which refused planning permission for just 3 detached houses at the southern end of this site. Full details in writing can be supplied if required.</p>	<p>To be considered at planning application stage.</p> <p>Change in legislation since this application.</p>
13b	BcS3 BcS4	<p>There is a proposal for a 30 metre buffer zone along the eastern side of Waterman's Lane, with public access. We think that this is excessive; it represents approximately 30% of the width of the whole plot given that the northern half is divided in two by a line of trees. The effect of this will be to push the development much closer to the surrounding houses.</p> <p>Whilst the Neighbourhood Plan provides for a buffer zone between the new development and existing houses, again with public access, it does not specify how large this should be. We believe this zone and the layout and landscaping around new houses will be compromised by the excessive requirement along the edge of Waterman's Lane. We believe a buffer zone of 15 metres alongside Waterman's Lane would be more balanced and appropriate.</p> <p>We are concerned about the security implications for public access to the buffer zone between the new development and existing housing (as, for example, a footpath and cycle lane) and who is going to be responsible for its maintenance. This needs clarification.</p> <p>We are opposed to a pedestrian footpath or cycle path from this site</p>	<p>Noted. Text amended as appropriate</p>

		<p>through site BCS4 Thorne’s Nursery to the Village Hall and Community Shop, unless it runs along the eastern boundary of both sites and does not allow access to Old Nursery Lane.</p> <p>We are also concerned about the potential for new housing to overlook existing properties and impact unacceptably upon their amenity value. Any new housing should be of a scale and siting that respects the character of the area and the privacy of existing residents. Existing properties in the area are typically one and a half, rather than a full two, storeys in height; any new development should reflect this.</p> <p>Other concerns we have for this site are that there is adequate provision for off street parking and that any new building, including self-build plots, once started is completed within a reasonable period of time.</p>	
20a	BcS3	<p>I make the following comments without prejudice: To safeguard the interests of the Community</p> <p>Ref: PRW Watermans Lane</p> <p>Estate Development in Open Countryside</p> <p>Multiple development which requires access by interference with a Public Right of Way sets a dangerous precedent within the Parish and throughout the District.</p> <p>Any such proposal should require a Modification Order</p> <p>Contrary to the emerging Brightwell-cum-Sotwell Planning Policy (BCSNP Policy 12)</p>	<p>This is a single developer. Policy is to avoid or minimise. As such the proposals should conform to the latter.</p>
32c	BcS12 (13)	<p>Land at Little Martins has been allocated for 30 dwellings accessed via Waterman's Lane to the south of the site.</p> <p>My client questions the proposed site access from Didcot Road onto</p>	

		<p>Watermans Lane and the allocation for 30 dwellings on this site as identified within the policy. The access is described within the sites assessment (BcSS 03a) as- 'the entrance to the site, from a sharp corner of the Didcot Road, would be visible and adversely affect the views, albeit only from a very small section of the Conservation Area'.</p> <p>The supporting text for Policy BCS3 highlights that Watermans Lane is a popular rural walk for the village and that the access design should preserve the rural character avoiding street lighting.</p> <p>My client is concerned with the provision of the access point to this site on a 'sharp corner' with limited visibility in either direction. It is also noted that the entrance to the site is visible from the conservation area and that views out of this part of the Conservation Area would be adversely affected.</p> <p>Further to the above comments, the sustainability appraisal and specifically the scoring matrix for this site (p24) should be reconsidered to take account of the implications of development on heritage, roads and rural character.</p>	<p>OCC Highways have been consulted.</p>
38d	BcS3	<p>The land at Little Martins and Home Farm Barns is proposed to be allocated for a development scheme comprising approximately 30 dwellings.</p> <p>This site is located on the far west side of the village and is some distance from the school, pub and bus stop. This site is furthermore encircled by houses which back directly onto the site, which could be affected by potential development. Care will need to be taken to mitigate impact on the adjacent homes and gardens.</p> <p>This site is located adjacent to the Conservation area and has the potential to impact on the setting of various listed buildings such as St Agatha's and Brightwell Manor.</p>	<p>Please see evidence base.</p>

		<p>The site currently has poor access, with the only access being Waterman Lane which is an unmade bridleway. Upgrading the bridleway to permit access to this large development site has the potential to significantly impact the rural character of the area.</p> <p>The proposal that this site is suitable for approximately 30 dwellings is questioned in light of the above constraints, the objectives of retaining landscaped buffer areas, hedgerows and treelines, and maintaining the lower density nature of the western side of the village which has a more rural character.</p>	

13c	BcS4	<p>We believe that up to five houses would be acceptable on this site.</p> <p>Once again, we are concerned about the potential for new housing to overlook existing properties and impact unacceptably upon their amenity value. Any new housing should be of a scale and siting that respects the character of the area and the privacy of existing residents.</p> <p>Access to the site should be via Old Nursery Lane only and the lane should be of a width sufficient to allow two vehicles to pass, with the exception of the section from Woodley's Cottage to its junction with West End.</p>	<p>The number has been restricted to four dwellings.</p> <p>These will be considered through the planning application process.</p>
32d	BcS4	<p>Land at Thornes Nursery has been allocated for 4 dwellings and an extension for the village hall car park. The site is accessed from Old Nursery Lane.</p> <p>My client objects to this site being allocated for residential development on the grounds of access, underdevelopment and impact on the conservation area. The restricted access along Old Nurseries Lane limits the proposed allocation to 4 dwellings. However the policy also proposes</p>	<p>Noted</p>

		<p>part of the site to be laid out as an extension to the village hall car park, and is therefore contrary to the access issues that form reasons for refusal in previous applications for this site.</p> <p>An Appeal for residential development on this site was dismissed in November 2001 (ref APP/Q3115/A/01/106/98/48) with specific mention to the vehicular access not being wide enough to allow vehicles travelling in opposite directions to pass, whilst still maintaining a safe route for pedestrians.</p> <p>The whole site falls within the conservation area. The inspector in the above appeal was not satisfied that the alterations needed to provide access to the highway network within the village could be carried out without having a harmful effect on the rural environment or the character or appearance of the conservation area.</p> <p>South Oxfordshire's Core Strategy (2012) sets out a minimum density of 25 dwellings per hectare unless this would have an adverse effect on the character of the area (Policy</p> <p>CSH2). The development of 4 dwellings on this site (1.1ha) is therefore considered to be an inefficient use of land.</p> <p>Further to the above comments the sustainability appraisal and specifically the scoring matrix for this site (p24) should be reconsidered to take account of the implications of development on heritage, roads and housing mix.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>

14a	General BcS1	<p>It is with disappointment that I have noticed that the Land at Five Acres appears to have been overlooked in your proposed Neighbourhood Plan. I grew up in the area and spent every weekend visiting my grandparents there. Our land would not only allow a few more affordable houses in the village but it is the desire of my family to adhere to the Visions of the Village, to keep the separate identity of a rural parish, in a way that allows the community to evolve. Our plans would include a memorial garden for my grandparents Phillip and Monica Lay and reinstating of Hazel nut trees to replace the historic nut walk linking the land previously owned by the Lay family. It gives an opportunity to link new family housing for children to stay in the village and keeping areas of greenery, as the plans would include planting of a buffer along the A4130 to include native hedgerow plants and a wildlife run and introduction of Owl housing.</p> <p>This land cannot be viewed by the Clumps and would be far better used for housing, than left derelict. It still has the farm building but other than that it is laying bare and is in need of some use. It is also better placed than other sites that you have considered appropriate.</p> <p>Even if a few houses were allowed and the rest used as conservation orchard area for those in that part of the village, it could add value and beauty to the village.</p> <p>Please will you reconsider this plot. It is in need of use. It would allow us to build something for the community so my grandparents could be remembered instead of being left as vacant land with no use. It would help rebalance the community profile to sustain facilities by providing new homes for first time buyers and young families without affecting the character of the village. It would not affect the character and small roads so important to the village and would seem a perfect round off site, which would enable the "Green Heart" of the village to be protected and stop the spreading of the village to neighbouring Wallingford.</p>	Noted see evidence base.
-----	-----------------	--	--------------------------

17a	General BcS1	<p>I am writing on behalf of myself & my sisters. We are the daughters of David Marc Lay deceased; my father, who worked as a grower alongside his father, on the Land at Five Acres, Sotwell, between 1978 and 1988, before he died of cancer.</p> <p>My father put a consortium of small growers together to try and meet the changing market forces of food production after we joined the Common Market in 1973. Over that 10 year period, a class 1 lettuce increased in size 3 fold, which meant the use of heavy chemical spraying was done by hand due to the small size of the field and I am sure this contributed to my fathers early death at the age of 37.</p> <p>This was the last time that our family used the land for growing, as it was not financially viable, even then. The land was then turned to grazing for horses using the water supply from my Grandmothers house, Five Acres but since that was sold, it has laid derelict and of no use.</p> <p>With this in mind, I find it difficult to understand why our land has not been adopted for one of the much need housing sites that have to be agreed in Brightwell-cum-Sotwell though the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Having looked at your web page and your requirements of any new sites, we do believe that ours is much better placed to fulfil your criteria than 2 of the other preferred sites. We are further away from the Whittenham Clumps than Home Farm and have direct access onto the A4130 minimising traffic flow through the small lanes of the village unlike Slade End.</p> <p>We are also greatly upset that you wish to draw a new village envelope, which will exclude our land and object to this vociferously.</p> <p>You have stated that you wish to protect the green heart of the village and to keep it isolated from Wallingford, protecting the historic character. The Land at Five Acres is a perfectly located to help you</p>	Noted please see evidence base.
-----	-----------------	---	---------------------------------

		achieve this and would support the round off, rather than expansion, of the village. My family are passionate about conservation and wish to include large wild life buffers and planting schemes to reflect the history of our land, enabling any housing to be kept discreet.	
18a	General BcS1	<p>I would like to formally complain about the failure to include the land at Five Acres in the Brightwell-cum-Sotwell Neighborhood Plan and its exclusion from the proposed new village envelope. As a concerned and interested party I would like it noted that given the submission of the Land at Five Acres to the Local Plan, it seems fair and logical that it be included as a perfect Round off Site, contained by the High Road and having direct access to this road, therefore protecting the historic lanes of the existing village. The land is no longer viable for agricultural use and I believe that the site at offers a superb opportunity to protect, preserve and reinstate valuable aspects of the village and village life whilst creating desperately needed development space. The reinstatement of an historic walk and well along with the creation of wildlife runs/habitat and replanting of native woodland species should all be considered as valuable assets to the local community that can be accessed via the inclusion of Five Acres.</p> <p>Lastly given the ownership of the land belonging to a family of long standing residency I understand that the land meets all the requisite criteria for inclusion and is better placed to do this than other sites that have been agreed.</p> <p>Considering all of the above it seems only right and proper that the Land at Five Acres land be included in the new envelope and allows the Neighbourhood Plan to represent the best possible opportunities for the village to have sustainable and equitable growth over the coming years.</p>	Noted please see evidence base.
21a	General BcS1	As you are aware, The Philip Lay Trust submitted the attached to the Local Plan for our land at Five Acres to be included in the submerging Local Plan via the Neighbourhood Plan. As there was no formal call for	Noted please see evidence base.

		<p>sites from yourselves, it appears that the inclusion of our land has been overlooked, despite meeting all of the criteria, which aims to deliver a strategy for growth, managing change and protecting the natural and historic identity of the village. As I have stated before, I am surprised at the lack of transparency in your decision to select appropriate sites, of which i believe we are better placed than two of the others. I am also disappointed that we were not contacted to discuss the plans for the village, when so many other developers/owners were.</p> <p>Although the Core Strategy allows for limited infill opportunities, this has led to a short fall, leading to a call for sites from the smaller settlements to submit suitable land to the edge of the existing villages, which can provide a sensitive and beneficial manner to the vitality and sustainability of the settlements needs for additional housing. We absolutely believe we are better placed to do than the selected sites of Slade End, which has limited access and prone to flooding and the Land at Little Martins and Home Farm Barns, which abuts the conservation area and in direct sight of the AONB. Both these sites would have detrimental effects on important listed building.</p> <p>Brightwell-cum-Sotwell is a linear village running south of the High Rd with excellent connections to the towns and facilities of Wallingford and Didcot but wishing to retains separate identity as a rural Parish. As such, the Green Heart of the village has been protected with development extending north but contained by the A4130, with little or no development to the east or west. The Land at Five Acres is one of two unused sites to the south of the High Road and so immediately deliverable and under one ownership. It is contained by the main road and would provide a perfect and sensitive Round Off to the village, conducive to the visions and objections of the Neighbourhood Plan. The introduction of a wild life buffer zone along the north of the site would provide excellent and sensitive screening.</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>The main objectives and visions for the Neighbourhood Plan Working Group can be summarised as follows</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Retain the character of the village by limiting infill within the pattern of development and conserving key landscape features 2) Avoid development close to the AONB and elongation to the east and west and protecting the Green Heart of the village 3) Use well located, non-productive agricultural or horticultural land on the edge of the village to minimise building on open green field land 4) Protect the conservation areas and listed buildings and their settings 5) Protect facilities and services and encourage proposals to sustain and improve their viability 6) Rebalance the community profile to sustain facilities by providing new homes for first time buyers, young families and older residents, allowing larger homes to become available to new residents. 7) Support sites that could re-instate a historic water feature 8) Support an element of self build. 9) Support work from home ability. 10) Inclusion of Community Space. <p>THE LAND AT FIVE ACRES IS ABLE TO FULFIL ALL OF THIS CRITERIA</p> <p>We have also offered to re-instate the old Well to Sotwell Manor, my Great Grandfathers Hazel Nut Walk from Sotwell manor drive to the</p>	
--	--	--	--

	<p>main road, plant a Memorial orchard of native fruit trees for my late parents and include wild life buffer of native trees suitable for jam making such as Quince. We have self built in the village for many generations and as growers, worked from home, so completely understand your requirements. As one of the oldest families in the village, you have been given our full undertaking to provide a sensitive and and discreet development in keeping with the beautiful and historic village, that we are all so passionate about.</p> <p>With all of this in mind, I shocked that the Neighbourhood Plan has decided to re-defined the Village Boundary also excluding the Land at Five Acres, which is outside of the AONB and Conservation Area, south of the High Road and non-productive agricultural/horticultural land.</p> <p>The Local Plan Policy map does not define a development boundary for the village, however, the Neighbourhood Plan wishes to re-introduce this, to provide clarity for proposing development schemes. This being the case, it should be an overall spatial plan of a proposed settlement edge to the village, with the intent to to distinguish and define the village from the surrounding countryside. It is clear that the Land at Five Acres does not form a component of the countryside surrounding the village by virtue of its location, south of the High Rd and encircled by village development to the south and west and further east at Slade End.</p> <p>As such it is considered that the proposed Spatial Plan and associated Village Boundary, is inconsistent with the objectives of the Neighbourhood Plan, in particular the objectives of avoiding development in and near the AONB and Conservation Area and the prolongation of the village.</p> <p>The Land at Five Acres in particular, has the ability to provide much needed housing for the village, therefore rendering this current</p>	<p>Noted. Not included, please see evidence base.</p>
--	--	---

		<p>proposed settlement boundary seems to be counter productive to the objectives of the Neighbourhood Plan and the principles of sustainable development. The Land at Five Acres presents a viable opportunity for the short term realisation of a significant component of the villages housing needs and the needs of the district.</p> <p>It is according requested that the site be included within the Village Boundary and allocated for housing of up to 20 dwellings.</p>	
25a	General BcS1	<p>As somebody with a vested interest in the land at Five Acres, I would like to respond to your consolation for the emerging Neighbourhood Plan and policies contained therein forming material considerations in the development of planning applications. The Neighbourhood Plan is designed to support the strategic development needs set out in the local plan and to positively support local development.</p> <p>My family land was submitted last year to the Local Plan, but despite the considerable work you have devoted to the emergence of this Plan, my family where never once contacted resulting in our exclusion not only from the new local Plan, but also the proposed new village envelope. Brightwell-cum-Sotwell is linear village contained to the north by boundary of the AONB and A4130. The village has evolved from the settlements of Brightwell, Sotwell and Slade End, with the hamlet of Mackney kept self contained. As these villages combined, all development was focussed towards the northern high road. There has been a notable absence of east/west expansion of the village to protect the separate identity as a rural parish to the surrounding towns and villages.</p> <p>The vision for the Plan is to preserve the identity of the village by limiting infill and preserving the essential characteristics of the village. The development will refrain from elongation and the development of village green spaces. It will be located appropriately on impotent agricultural and horticultural land on the outskirts of the village to protect open</p>	Noted. Please see evidence base.

		fields, as well as conservation areas, listed buildings and sustain and advance services and facilities. To exclude this land, I believe would be detrimental to the village and would not be complicit to the stringent guidelines of the emerging Local Plan.	
26a	General BcS1	<p>The Philip Lay Trust have requested that the Land at Five Acres be included within the Local Plan. My land includes the old Sotwell Manor well and lies on the southern boundary of Five Acres. Unfortunately, my land and the land at Five Acres have been overlooked for inclusion despite meeting all the requirements and criteria of the Local Plan.</p> <p>These are sites which would allow for development opportunities for sympathetic and discreet expansion, thus protecting the natural and historic identity of the village and containing development below the A4130 and AONB and outside of the conservation area and enabling the protection of the green spaces at the heart of the village.</p> <p>The Local Plan Policy map does not define a development boundary for the village, however, the Neighbourhood Plan wishes to re-introduce this, to provide clarity for proposed development schemes.</p> <p>Therefore, it would be sensible that the Neighbourhood Plan redraw the Village boundary, so that a clear distinction between the village and the surrounding countryside is defined. This being the case my land and the Land at Five Acres do not form a part of the countryside surrounding the village by advantage of its location, south of the High Rd and already surrounded by village development on the south west and east sides. Not to include this land would seem to be against the guidelines of the Local Plan and Government.</p> <p>The Core Strategy allows for limited infill opportunities which has led to a short fall in appropriate sites, there is therefore a call for sites from the</p>	<p>Noted. Not included, please see evidence base.</p> <p>Noted. Not amended, please see evidence base.</p>

		<p>smaller settlements to submit suitable land which can provide the space for much needed additional housing. I believe that my land and that of Five Acres meets this requirement in a sensitive and sympathetic manner.</p>	
29a	General BcS1	<p>I see no reason why the Land at Five Acres and the land adjacent to it belonging to Brian Robinson should not be included in the in the Local Plan as it is within the boundary of the A4140 and would not extend the village in the easterly or westerly directions.</p> <p>The Core Strategy allows for limited infill opportunities which has led to a short fall in appropriate sites, there is therefore a call for sites from the smaller settlements to submit suitable land which provide the space for much needed housing. In my view the land of Five Acres and that of Brian Robinson fully meets this requirement to infill in a sensitive and sympathetic manner.</p>	<p>Noted. Not included, please see evidence base.</p>
30a	General BcS1	<p>It is with considerable regret that I find it necessary to write this letter in response to your consultation, to remind you of your failure to make all necessary parties aware of the existence of the Neighbourhood Plan Working Group and its objective to help local people to remain living in one of the most beautiful villages in the area. For a village to thrive it needs many things which can not be quantified by a few words. Having been brought up in Sotwell and having a great love of the area, it has been my one regret that I was unable to remain in the village after I married and started a family, as local housing was expensive even then and frequently unsuitable for comfortable modern living. Who would not wish to live in one of the unspoilt villages, which must never be allowed to become "just a suburb of Wallingford or Didcot". An element of mixed population is necessary for the thriving of local amenities, including the School, Shop, Playground, Bus service, etc. and therefor that essence which can only be described as a "Real Village". I believe this is why the formation of the Neighbourhood Plan was introduced.</p> <p>I do not understand why neither myself nor members of my family, still</p>	<p>Members of the family were present at two of the well attended public meetings and their names recorded.</p>

		<p>local and one of the oldest landowners in the village, were not contacted and invited to submit when the Neighbourhood Plan was being formulated? It leaves me astonished that a piece of derelict land, within the natural confines of the village, totally unsuitable for agriculture in the modern world and unable to be used for grazing, due to an absence of a water supply after my mother had to leave Five Acres due to illness, was not included in the Plan.... Surely this was the whole point of the Neighbourhood Plan being formed?</p> <p>As our land is not clearly visible from the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, screened by hedge rows, yet nestling within the village, south of the High Road, with a public cycle/footpath to the central parts of the village, why was not considered? It may be one of the most suitable areas of the village for a small discreet development that adheres to all your requisites to retain the character of the village by limiting infill, thus protecting the lanes, character and central green spaces, so crucial to the village enjoyment of this historic settlement which my family married into and started contributing housing to some 380 years ago.</p> <p>Although I no longer living there, I still feel an obligation to help safe guard my family land and prevent it being diluted, thus keeping the essence of the village community that we would so like to contribute to with the inclusion of our land for housing and communal planting as a memorial to our family.</p>	<p>Noted. Not included, please see evidence base.</p>
31a	General BcS1	<p>It is with disappointment that I have been notified that The Land at Five Acres, for which I am an Executor for my late mother, Monica Lay, has not been included either in the emerging Neighbourhood Plan or new proposed boundaries for a Village Envelope</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan was introduced to support and enhance the</p>	<p>Members of the family were present at two of the well attended public meetings and their names recorded.</p>

		<p>emerging Local Plan for the strategic developments and needs of our county, namely to provide local housing, in keeping with the historic integrity of the villages in South Oxfordshire and the protection of rural aspects and configurations of these settlements.</p> <p>I would like to point out that our family land at Five Acres has the ability and requisites to enhance and protected all the requirements of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>The configuration of Brightwell-cum Sotwell has been predominately to the northern boundary to The High Road, so protecting the village from merging into neighbouring towns and villages. Our family land would continue in this pattern, as it is placed directly onto the High Road but away from the AONB and Conservation Area. It would also protect the green heart of the village and historic lanes, which are unable to cope with traffic through them.</p> <p>I would ask that you continue to support the outlining guides to the Local Plan by including our well placed land into the proposed village envelope.</p>	<p>Noted. Not included, please see evidence base.</p>
32e	General BcS1 and Site Allocation Report	<p>Sotwell Manor Fruit Farm BcSS 11a</p> <p>Sotwell Manor Fruit farm extends to 3.3 hectares (8.1 acres) and is currently part occupied by a garden nursery used for growing soft fruit available for 'pick your own' and ready picked sales. The nursery is accessed from High Road (A1430) to the north. The site is located outside but adjacent to the settlement boundary of Brightwell-cumSotwell. There are no physical constraints on site but the North Wessex Downs AONB surrounds the village.</p>	

		<p>The Site also benefits from bus stops along High Road and is within close proximity to Wallingford and the town of Didcot. Didcot Parkway railway station is 4.5 miles from the site and Cholsey railway station is also within 4 miles of the site.</p> <p>The following comments are raised in relation to the site assessment;</p> <p>Rural Character - The site is well contained and therefore the secluded setting would reduce the impact of development on the rural character of the village. It can be demonstrated that access from the A4130 would not be a significant constraint on proposed development nor would the proposed access have a detrimental impact upon the rural character of the area. Highways advice has been taken and this has highlighted access is not an issue.</p> <p>Landscape Setting - It is considered that the landscape has moderate capacity to absorb further residential development and proposals will be carefully designed so that they do not effect the setting of the AONB. The site is visually well contained; there are limited views to the site from the surrounding landscape and publically accessible land. Wallingford is separated by development to the east and therefore this site does not infill the gap or cause coalescence between Wallingford and the village.</p> <p>Land Use - The PYO fruit farm will be retained and development will be located on the southern portion of the site together with a pedestrian/cycle route connecting to Five Acres public footpath.</p> <p>Conservation Area - The site falls outside of the conservation area and is not close to any listed buildings.</p> <p>Core Facilities - As well as access from the A4130 the site can also be accessed via a public footpath (known as Five Acres) that runs along the</p>	<p>Noted. Please see evidence base.</p> <p>Noted. Please see evidence base.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>
--	--	---	--

	<p>north-western boundary of the site linking to Sotwell Street. The site is therefore within close proximity to services and facilities within the village; Brightwell Primary School, Post Office and The Village Stores - 1.4km. The Red Lion - 1.km and St James Church - 0.6km. Local bus stops are located 350m east and 700m west of the site. In comparison to the draft allocations at Slade End Green this site is located closer to the listed village facilities.</p> <p>Community Profile - As discussed there would not be a loss of local business or PYO facility</p> <p>The Promotion Site</p> <p>Sotwell Manor Fruit Farm represents a more suitable site than those proposed to be allocated under policy BCS3, BCS4 and BSC5a, b, c of the emerging Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>It is evident from the above that there is a strong case for allocating land at Sotwell Manor Fruit Farm for residential development. The site is not only suitable but also available and achievable as follows;</p> <p>Suitability</p> <p>☑ The site is immediately adjacent to the defined settlement policy boundary for Brightwell Cum Sotwell ☑ The site occupies a sustainable location and is well located to benefit from a number of community facilities and services within walking distance. These local services include a village store, post office, pub, church and primary school. ☑ The site to the south of the PYO fruit farm can accommodate the total number of dwellings currently allocated in policy BCS 3,4 and 5a,b and c ☑ The site's access is located off the A4130. This will therefore alleviate potential new development traffic running through the centre of Brightwell. There are no overriding constraints to prevent the site</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted. Not included see evidence</p>
--	--	--

		<p>coming forward</p> <p>Availability</p> <p>☑ The site is within one land ownership and IPE Orchestra Land are promoting the site for residential development.</p> <p>Achievability</p> <p>☑ There are no technical constraints to preventing this from coming forward for residential development immediately, and if allocated IPE Orchestra Land are keen to progress its proposals for the site in full consultation with the Parish Council and community ☑ Land at Sotwell Manor Fruit Farm should therefore be included in the Neighbourhood Plan as a housing allocation, instead of existing proposals within the Draft Plan.</p>	base.
38e	General BcS2 BcS1	<p>In light of the shortcomings of the above sites there are a number of impediments to achieving the stated aim of making provision for 50 dwellings in the village, as summarised below: -</p> <p>☑ The development at Bosley's orchard is 7 units short of the 20-unit target ☑ The development at Slade farm is unlikely to progress, particularly in the short term, due to, among others, land assembly constraints and flooding considerations. Furthermore, this site does not offer a significant number of opportunities which further serves as a barrier to sustainable delivery. ☑ The land at Little Martins and Home Farm Barns is constrained by its access and position on the western, rural edge of the village, along with the requisite buffer areas this site may not be capable of delivering 30 units. ☑ The land at Thorne's Nursery aims to deliver only four units</p> <p>The site at Five Acres is considered to be a suitable site for the delivery of housing in the village, which can provide a meaningful and predicable</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>

	<p>delivery of homes as a contribution to the stated objectives of delivering 50 new homes in the village. The site is immediately deliverable, in under single ownership and can provide a development which is consistent with the vision and objectives of the neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>While a comparatively large site at some 2.3 hectares, a density of around 10 dwellings per hectare is considered appropriate for the site in light of the lower density development to the west, horticultural land to the east and more recent residential development to the south. A lower density development for the site reflects the existing settlement pattern in the area and allows for the retention of existing hedges and vegetation, the creation of substantial buffer areas to the High Road and the provision of generous landscaped areas, which would retain the rural character by enhancing the network of trees, hedgerows and wildlife areas.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the location of the site within the village, the site benefits further from frontage to the High Road to the north and Five Acres lane to the east, as well as a comparatively low number of residential neighbours to the west and south, due to the large properties to the west and the generous width of the properties to the south. As such the site is not significantly constrained by potential impacts arising from a large number of immediately abutting neighbours such as the sites at Bosley's Orchard or Little Martins and Home Farm Barns.</p> <p>The site is presently unutilised and is put to occasional paddock use. The site is well contained within boundary trees and hedges which encircle the site aside from some small gaps, particularly along the Five Acres lane to the east of the site.</p> <p>The site does not form a component of the Green Heart of the village which comprises two large portions of land south of Brightwell Street and Sotwell Street, the land forming the primary school and playing</p>	
--	---	--

		<p>fields to the south and west and the land west of Bell Lane. The Green Heart of the village forms a network of green spaces within and to the south of the village. A small portion of land to the southwest of the site also forms a component of the Green Heart, proposals are intended to be structured to align a portion of publically accessible space with this component of the Green Heart, thus expanding and enhancing the Green Heart.</p> <p>The small size of the site, lack of agricultural water supply, and high flint content of the soil renders the site largely unsuitable for productive agriculture or the keeping of livestock</p> <p>The site offers easy access either directly from the High Road or from Five Acres lane to the east of the site, traffic accessing the site would not need to penetrate the village. Existing lanes and narrow roads can be retained, in keeping with the character of the village.</p> <p>The site is very well positioned to deliver new dwelling houses within the short term and has good proximity and accessibility to the village's post office, pub, hall and school. The site furthermore has excellent access to the High Road which affords rapid access to Didcot and Wallingford and the associated commuter routes into the London.</p> <p>The site presents an opportunity for a range of materials, building styles and types, which can be provided due to the position of the site abutting different character areas, ranging from the historic village, contemporary developments to the east and the High Road to the north.</p> <p>The site presents an opportunity for high quality design, use of varied and local materials such as red brick, flint and clay tiles.</p> <p>Five Acres is contained within the eastern edge of the village and is south of the AONB and the High Road and the development of the site would</p>	
--	--	---	--

	<p>not result in a harmful northwards expansion of the village and would be considered a rounding off of the existing village form. The village presently wraps around the site, leaving the site a vacant portion or gap of redundant horticultural land within the village edge.</p> <p>As Brightwell-cum-Sotwell is a linear village which extends some distance to the east, beyond the site, and up to the High Road which forms the northern boundary of the site, the allocation of the site for housing would not alter the linear nature of the village, would not extend the northern boundary of the village north of the High Road and beyond the northern alignment of the village into the AONB and as such the inclusion of the site within the Village Boundary and its allocation for housing would not alter the overall appearance of the village within its rural setting</p> <p>The site is immediately available for development and can be brought forward for development within the plan period. The owners of the site have been local residents in the village for a number of years and have contributed to the development of the village through the construction of a number of homes, notably Sotwell Manor and at Five Acres as well as the construction of the bell tower of St James' Church.</p> <p>The development of the site is to be in accordance with the following key principles</p> <p>☐ Conserve the rural character of the village ☐ Maintain the village settings ☐ Provide a mix of home sizes ☐ Respect the historic boundaries of the village and the site ☐ Provide for shared surfaces ☐ Provide an informal layout reflecting the form of the village and its lanes (avoiding an estate like appearance) ☐ Provide a sense of place ☐ Make use of appropriate materials ☐ Provide for complimentary tree and hedge planting ☐ Provide ecological areas ☐ Provide and strengthen pedestrian linkages</p>	
--	---	--

		<p>8.0 Conclusion</p> <p>A number of the proposed allocations are constrained or have shortcomings which cast uncertainty on the ability to achieve the delivery of 50 units in the village, notably the land at Bosley’s Orchard is, in terms of the current application to deliver 7 fewer units than intended.</p> <p>The allocation of the site at Five Acres is considered to fulfil the objectives of the neighbourhood plan by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☑ Retaining the character of the village and the pattern of development and conserving key landscape features ☑ Developing outside of the AONB, preventing the elongation of the village ☑ Developing well-located, non-productive horticultural land on the edge of the village, thus protecting open green field land ☑ Preventing impact on conservation areas and listed buildings ☑ Providing new homes to sustain and improve the viability of services and facilities. ☑ Providing new homes for a range of buyers including first time buyers, young families and older residents. <p>The site presents a viable opportunity for the short term realisation of a significant component of the village’s housing need and the housing needs of the district.</p> <p>It is accordingly requested that the site be included within the Village Boundary and is to be allocated for housing use for up to 20 dwellings.</p>	<p>Noted. Site not included please see evidence base.</p>
36a	General BcS1	<p>I would like to feedback to your consolation for the emerging Neighbourhood Plan and policies contained in that matter forming material attention in the progress of the planning applications, as I have a great involvement and interest in the land at 5 Acres. The plan is designed to support the strategic development needs set out in the local plan and to support local development successfully.</p>	

		<p>Last year my familys land was submitted to the local plan although the significant amount of work you have done to the emergence of this plan, unfortunately we have not been approached since about the exclusion not only from new local plan, but also the new expected village envelope. Brightwell-cum-Sotwell is a continuous village within the north by boundary of the AONB and A4130. The village has evolved from the settlements of Brighwell, Sotwell and Slade End, with the hamlet of Mackney kept self contained. All of these villages together, all development was towards the northern high road. There has been high profile about of absence of east/west expansion of the village to assure the separate identity as a rural harsh to the surrounding towns and villages.</p> <p>The vision for the Plan is to keep the identity of the village by limiting infill and preserving the essential characteristics of the village. The development will refrain from elongation and the development of village green spaces. It will be located roughly on unproductive agricultural and horticultural land on the outskirts of the village to protect open fields, as well as conservation areas, listed buildings and sustain and advance services and facilities. To exclude this land, I believe would be negative to the village and would not be complicit to the stringent guidelines of the emerging Local Plan.</p>	<p>Members of the family were present at two of the well attended public meetings and their names recorded.</p>
33a	General	<p><i>Planning Policy Context</i></p> <p>We commend the progressive approach adopted within the emerging Brightwell-Cum-Sotwell Parish Neighbourhood Plan with regards to the amount of growth to be accommodated within the village over the Plan Period. The Plan wisely considers the emerging policy direction and evidence which projects an increased allocation of growth at smaller villages with high sustainability credentials.</p>	<p>Noted</p>

	BcS1	<p>We advise amending 'saved policy' in paragraph 3.10 to 'Saved policies of the Local Plan 2011' for clarity.</p> <p>The sentence in paragraph 4.8 is incomplete.</p> <p>In our view, the settlement boundary in Policy BCS1: A Spatial Plan for the Parish is drawn too tightly and offer's little scope for accommodating further growth if considered necessary over the plan period, or if the chosen allocated sites are not deliverable or do not yield the number of dwellings required as expected. This is evidential already through the submission of an outline application for up to 13 dwellings on land at Bosley's Orchard, originally allocated in the emerging Brightwell-Cum-Sotwell Neighbourhood Plan for up to 20 dwellings. As such, the possibility of further reductions in the anticipated number of dwellings for the other allocated sites through the development management process cannot be ignored, in which event further sites will need to be identified to address any shortfall.</p>	<p>Noted. See supporting evidence base</p> <p>Noted. This reduction would not affect our minimum requirement.</p>
	BcS2	<p>On page 22 it states 'the Neighbourhood Plan has reviewed the most sustainable edges of the village to plan for new homes' yet does not clarify which edge, or elaborate. The statement is read as a single sentence, without any prior reference or elaboration, and has no relation to the content of the rest of the paragraph. The Plan should explain how the relative sustainability of different parts of the village</p>	<p>Policy BcS1 has been amended.</p>

	<p>BcS5</p> <p>Site Assessment report</p>	<p>has been assessed.</p> <p>Policy BCS5A: Slade End Farm gives no indication of the number of housing units to be allocated at this site and therefore a figure cannot be contributed to the total estimated number of dwellings to be provided within Brightwell-Cum-Sotwell during the Plan period. Within the site assessment report which is published as the evidence base for selecting the site allocations in the village, the site is referenced as BCSS10a. Within this reference the site is stated as not being close to the village facilities and recognises that there is a long history of applications affecting the house and barns. A Planning Appeal relating to the erection of a single dwelling was dismissed in 2003 citing impact on the conservation area. Consequently, there are serious doubts as to whether the site can accommodate any residential development. The previous judgement that the site was unsuitable for residential development needs to be explained in the light of the proposed allocation.</p> <p>We note that many of the chosen allocated sites have a history of planning refusals and dismissed appeals. Although it is accepted that some of these decisions relate back more than 20 years, and that the current context and policy situation has moved on from then, some sites have had appeals dismissed for residential development as recently as 4 years ago. There is considerable uncertainty over whether the allocated sites in the emerging Brightwell-Cum-Sotwell</p>	<p>Policy BcS5 has been amended to include housing numbers.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted. Text amended to expand on delivery</p>
--	---	--	---

	<p>Site Assessment report</p> <p>Sustainability Appraisal Report</p>	<p>Neighbourhood Plan will deliver the target figure of between 50 and 60 new residential dwellings over the plan period.</p> <p>There is a desire to include self-build plots within the policies for the allocated sites, however it is not explained where this desire comes from and there is no attempt to demonstrate a need for this type of development. It would be helpful to show the justification for the inclusion of this type of development.</p> <p><i>Site Assessment Report</i></p> <p>As a general comment, and with relevance to the commentary on the assessments of the identified sites, any statements referencing the settlement boundary should be pre-fixed with the word 'proposed' as currently there is no agreed Brightwell-Cum-Sotwell settlement boundary. The settlement boundary is proposed through the Brightwell-Cum-Sotwell Neighbourhood Plan which is yet to be scrutinised through examination.</p> <p><i>Draft Sustainability Appraisal Report (incorporating a Strategic Environmental Assessment)</i></p> <p>The main sustainability issues in the Parish are outlined in paragraph 7 of the report, however, when compared with the sites assessment report, it is clear that some of the sites chosen for allocation within the emerging Neighbourhood Plan are not best suited to remedy these highlighted issues.</p> <p>The first bullet point in paragraph 7 states that there is an issue with</p>	<p>Noted. This comes from the housing needs survey.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted</p>
--	--	---	--

	<p>the affordability of all forms of housing within the parish. The ability to bring forth a greater stock of affordable dwellings is hampered by the preferred spatial strategy (BCS1) of the NP. South Oxfordshire District Council apply the DCLG's Written Ministerial Statement on affordable housing when calculating the affordable housing provision on sites for development. The Statement infers that affordable housing should only be sought on developments of over 10 units. The preferred spatial strategy in the Brightwell Cum Sotwell Neighbourhood Plan opts for a selection of smaller sites well below this threshold, therefore affordable units will not be provided. Currently only two allocations, BSC2 and BCS3 of the emerging Brightwell Cum Sotwell Neighbourhood Plan, would trigger the requirement to provide affordable housing units. If the spatial strategy of the NP was expanded to include more sites of over 10 units then a greater proportion of affordable units would be delivered in the village and thereby one of the key sustainability issues would start to be remedied.</p> <p>This issue is emphasised in the Key Message from Policy Context column in the table on page 4 of the report. It is unclear and unjustified as to why the sustainability objective for this key message states that delivering 'at least 10 new homes within the plan period' would achieve this aim. Was the sustainability objective meant to state 'at least 10 new affordable homes within the plan period'?</p> <p>In addition, allocating more sites for development of over 10 units</p>	<p>Noted. There is a desire for smaller scale developments</p>
--	--	--

	BcS1	<p>would also address sustainability issue 2 (difficulty of moving house within the parish), and 3 (little scope for downsizing), by increasing the choice of housing stock within the village. Larger development sites would mean an increase in the number of smaller units available to local residents to downsize to etc.</p> <p>P7 – The Pre-Submission draft of the Neighbourhood Plan is out for an 8 week consultation period, not 6 as stated. This should be amended for consistency.</p> <p>The site identified as ‘Rectory Meadows’ in the Site Assessment Report as evidence to the emerging Brightwell-Cum-Sotwell Neighbourhood Plan would provide a valuable contribution to the local affordable housing stock, provide large areas of open space including a Local Area for Play (LAP), and provide a range and choice of housing in the village.</p>	<p>Text amended.</p> <p>Noted. Not included, please see evidence base.</p>
--	------	---	--

39b	General	I am in agreement with the proposed plan for the next 60 houses in the village, as no doubt we have got to have some with all the building of houses in the area.	Noted
2a	General	Just a quick note to say I support the proposed NP and its recommendations.	Noted
3b	General	We are very much behind the Neighbourhood Plan as we think the way it has been done has taken great care to survey and accurately represent the wishes of local people.	Noted
4b	General	We would like to express our support for the proposed document, the	Noted

		<p>Pre-Submission report produced by the team working on the Neighbourhood Plan. In our view great care has been taken with this report to maintain the Rural nature of our wonderful village. We are happy with the sites proposed for development by the plan and feel that the infrastructure of the village, in terms of roads and indeed mains sewage would not be of a sufficient capacity to deal with any further expansion.</p>	
5a	General	<p>I am writing to support the Pre-Submission and Draft Sustainability Appraisal Reports. The proposed neighbourhood plan represents a bold and creative solution to a long-standing problem: how to balance the desire to retain all that gives our community its special character against the pressing need for more housing. I particularly like the idea of giving a new coherence to the Slade End Farm end of the village, which would re-use redundant land in an imaginative way; the proposals for green buffers to minimise the impact of pockets of development elsewhere – and the emphasis on the need to keep the distinction between the built-up area and the surrounding countryside.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan team have been meticulous in consulting the community at every possible stage, and I feel confident that the silent majority supports their proposals. The housing needs survey clearly shows the need for smaller dwellings for those at either end of the age spectrum, rather than the enormous statement executive-style houses favoured by developers. This plan would enable villagers to take control of their environment, and I sincerely hope that it meets with general approval.</p>	Noted
8a	General	<p>I am writing this email to confirm our support of the Neighbourhood plan because we believe it to be in Brightwell cum Sotwell's best interest to work with the developers rather than against them.</p>	Noted
10a	General	<p>Whilst nobody welcomes new development in our village, we have to be realistic and suggest a level of housing provision that offers</p>	Noted

		approximately a 10% increase in our housing stock. We would certainly support potential development of the suggested sites BCS 2-5 as presented in the Plan, albeit with the caveats mentioned. The spread of access routes to these areas, by accident of geography, represents a useful dilution factor.	
16a	General	I have been to the recent meetings, looked through the reports and submissions produced by the council. I feel the submissions have been very well researched, analysed, documented and presented with both what is required for the area, how this fits in with the overall government aims and still maintains the overall integrity of the village. I would welcome the outcome as submitted by the council.	Noted
22a	General BcS4	I am writing on behalf of my family to say that we are very grateful for all the hard work you all have done regarding the Neighbourhood Plan (nightmare I should think). As we are the sole owners of the West End Nursery site I think you all have done a very good job on sorting the sites for development and I feel they should enhance the future of the village.	Noted
24a	General	We moved to Brightwell cum Sotwell in 1990 with a young family, and then moved to a larger house within the village as this rural village community with the much valued facilities of a primary school, pub and shops (within a commutable distance of work in London) fulfilled all our requirements. We are now retired and see our life continuing here, and might wish to downsize to suit our personal needs at some point in the future. We are writing to give our wholehearted backing and support for the excellent Brightwell cum Sotwell Parish Neighbourhood Plan 2016-32 Pre-Submission Plan, its vision, objectives and land use policies. We feel they give an entirely balance view with a sensible approach to the need for a variety of additional housing to allow a good social/age mix in the village whilst retaining its green heart, the village character and aid the continuation and growth of our present amenities.	Noted

		We have attended the regular and very informative meetings during the process of development of this Plan and have been pleased to witness the strong feeling of support for it.	
27a	General	<p>It has been brought to our attention the possibilities of a development plan of 110 houses to be built on the so called Lay's fruit farm which runs parallel with High Rd.</p> <p>Our property backs onto this piece of land which is under consideration. The long stretch of land which runs closely to the A4130 High road provides a classic boundary of which if development took place the village would lose its distinct character and become merged in with the up-coming development on the Wallingford bypass</p> <p>We are in full favour of the content of the new neighbourhood plan, and wish keep within sixty five houses allocated to all villages without destroying any conservational areas, and areas of AONB!</p>	Noted
28a	General	<p>It is extremely difficult to add anything more to the tremendous work that your committee has done on our behalf with regard to the housing development within the parish. We have been extremely lucky to have such talented individuals putting our case so well.</p> <p>I would simply like to thank them very much indeed.</p>	Noted

40d	General	You have done a great service to the village in drawing up this most complicated document and like most of the people in the village I am very grateful to you.	Noted
42e	General	<p>We would like to send our thanks to the NP committee for the many hours of labour involved, and for enduring facing up to the many difficulties and frustrations that must have been involved in getting the Plan to this point.</p> <p>With Congratulations and thanks</p>	Noted
1c	General	First of all and most importantly, we hugely appreciate the amount of	Noted

		work which has gone into this plan. Just to read through it is a major effort so we cannot guess what amount of effort has gone into the writing of it. Congratulations and thank you very much.	
3c	General	We are very grateful to those who have taken the time to do this as we know it has been a huge task.	Noted
4c	General	We wish to thank all those involved in production of the report.	Noted
8b	General	We would also like to thank the Parish Council for all their efforts in drawing up this plan and very much hope that they are able to get it in place as soon as possible.	Noted
9c	General	Firstly, I would like to take the opportunity to thank the Parish Council for all their time and effort in pulling together the Neighbourhood plan ("Plan"), in particular Jason and Helen. It is easy to under estimate the amount of time it would have taken to compile the Plan.	Noted
10b	General	The authors of the comprehensive suite of documents should be congratulated on the thoroughness of their documents. Clearly a lot of time and effort has been taken to collect evidence and weigh up the options. The Plan may not be sufficient to save us from some sort of over-ruling in future years, but it must surely be far better than the village not offering our own plan. The greatest threat of course is the persistent under-provision of new housing by Oxfordshire CC.	Noted

The following are comments from SODC (their format retained)				Steering Group Response
SODC ref	Section/Policy	Comment	Recommendation	
1	<p>Foreword – Paragraph 5 and 8</p> <p><u>Paragraph 5</u> The parish retains many facilities such as a pub, a shop (with a post office), a school, the village pub, village hall, a riverside hotel, several garages and an award winning vineyard...</p> <p><u>Paragraph 8</u> To meet the parish’s housing needs and to guide sustainable development, it was agreed in 2013 at the Brightwell cum Sotwell Parish Meeting to develop a Neighbourhood Plan. The Parish Council established a sub-group to consult on and produce a neighbourhood plan with the intention that following referendum the Brightwell cum Sotwell Neighbourhood Plan will form part of South Oxfordshire District Council’s local plan to guide development within our parish.</p>	<p><u>Paragraph 5</u> This section lists pub twice.</p> <p><u>Paragraph 8</u> The South Oxfordshire District Council’s local plan is one of a series of documents which alongside neighbourhood plans form part of the Development Plan for the District.</p>	<p><u>Paragraph 5</u> If the intention is to refer to two pubs, this should be clarified.</p> <p><u>Paragraph 8</u> Amend section to: To meet the parish’s housing needs and to guide sustainable development, it was agreed in 2013 at the Brightwell cum Sotwell Parish Meeting to develop a Neighbourhood Plan. The Parish Council established a sub-group to consult on and produce a neighbourhood plan with the intention that following referendum the Brightwell cum Sotwell Neighbourhood Plan will form part of South Oxfordshire’s Development Plan and will guide development within our parish.</p>	Text amended
2	<p>Vision – Page 5 and Paragraph 5.1</p> <p>The Vision for Brightwell is: <i>“To retain our separate identity as a rural parish set within open countryside, conserving the character of</i></p>	<p>It is important to take every opportunity to demonstrate/express that the NDP has looked at the neighbourhood area as a</p>	<p>Amend section to: 5.1 The Vision for Brightwell-cum-Sotwell is: <i>“To retain our separate identity as a rural parish set within open</i></p>	Text amended

	<i>the various settlements; in a way that allows the community to evolve whilst sustaining our core vital services”</i>	whole.	<i>countryside, conserving the character of the various settlements; in a way that allows the community to evolve whilst sustaining our core vital services”</i>	
3	<p>Paragraph 1.2</p> <p>The purpose of the Brightwell cum Sotwell Parish Neighbourhood Plan (BPNP) is to make planning policies that can be used to determine planning applications in the area in the period to March 2032. Its policies aim to positively plan for the growth of the main village but to do in ways that will protect the special character of the Parish.</p>	It is important that neighbourhood plans use positive language to ensure that changes which could improve and enhance the neighbourhood plan area are not discouraged.	<p>Amend section to:</p> <p>The purpose of the Brightwell cum Sotwell Parish Neighbourhood Plan (BPNP) is to make planning policies that can be used to determine planning applications in the area in the period to March 2032. Its policies aim to positively plan for the growth of the main village but to do in ways that will protect and enhance the special character of the Parish.</p>	Text amended
4	<p>Paragraph 1.7</p> <p>These requirements will be tested by an independent examiner once the Neighbourhood Plan is finalised. If satisfied, the examiner will recommend that the plan goes to referendum of the local electorate. If a simple majority of the turnout votes for the Plan, then it becomes adopted as formal planning policy for the area.</p>	It is important to make clear that the independent examiner’s report is not legally binding on the Council and that currently NDPs do not automatically become a statutory document following the referendum.	<p>Amend section to:</p> <p>These requirements will be tested by an independent examiner once the Neighbourhood Plan is finalised. If satisfied, the examiner will recommend that South Oxfordshire District Council should progress the plan to a referendum of the local electorate. If the Council decides to progress the plan to a referendum, and a simple majority of the turnout votes in favour the Plan, the Council must adopt it as formal</p>	Text amended

			planning policy for the area, so long as the plan doesn't breach EU Regulations.	
5	<p>Paragraph 3.2 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) published by the government in 2012 is an important guide in the preparation of local plans and neighbourhood plans. The BPNP must demonstrate that it is consistent with the provisions of the NPPF. The following paragraphs of the NPPF are especially relevant to the BPNP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supporting a prosperous rural economy (paragraph 28) • Good Design (paragraph 58) • Protecting healthy communities (paragraph 70) • Protecting local green spaces (paragraph 76) • Conserving and enhancing the natural environment (paragraph 109) • Conserving and enhancing the historic environment (paragraph 126) • Neighbourhood planning (paragraph 185) 	<p>It is important that readers are made aware that the plan is consistent with the NPPF as a whole.</p>	<p>Amend section to: 3.2 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) published by the government in 2012 is an important guide in the preparation of local plans and neighbourhood plans. The BPNP must demonstrate that it is consistent with the provisions of the NPPF as a whole. The following paragraphs of the NPPF are especially relevant to the issues addressed by the BPNP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supporting a prosperous rural economy (paragraph 28) • Good Design (paragraph 58) • Protecting healthy communities (paragraph 70) • Protecting local green spaces (paragraph 76) • Conserving and enhancing the natural environment (paragraph 109) • Conserving and enhancing the historic environment (paragraph 126) 	Text amended

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Neighbourhood planning (paragraph 185) 	
6	<p>Paragraph 3.5</p> <p>The essence of the overall planning strategy for the District has been and will continue to be to focus development on the main towns and larger villages of the District and to maintain the rural character of the open countryside that makes up the majority of the area. The Parish does not lie within an area planned for growth and is currently considered a 'smaller village'.</p>	<p>It is important that we take any opportunity to show that the NDP views appropriate development in a positive light. The NPPF support for prosperous rural communities envisages a level of growth, the local policy context indicates that this level of growth should be limited or lesser than the levels expected for larger villages and towns.</p>	<p>Amend section to:</p> <p>3.5 The essence of the overall planning strategy for the District has been and will continue to be to focus development on the main towns and larger villages of the District and to maintain the rural character of the open countryside that makes up the majority of the area. The Parish does not lie within an area planned for significant growth and is currently considered a 'smaller village'.</p>	Noted
7	<p>Paragraph 3.8</p> <p>More generally, the housing supply strategy of the Core Strategy is deemed out of date by §49 of the NPPF, given the District Council cannot demonstrate it has a five year supply of housing land, and this is unlikely to change until the new Local Plan is adopted. The new strategy proposes a significant increase in the pace and scale of housing development over the period to 2032.</p>	<p>It is necessary to add the word "currently" to make the description of the District's housing land supply position factually accurate.</p>	<p>Amend section to:</p> <p>More generally, the housing supply strategy of the Core Strategy is currently deemed out of date by §49 of the NPPF, given the District Council cannot demonstrate it has a five year supply of housing land, and this is unlikely to change until the new Local Plan is adopted. The new strategy proposes a significant increase in the pace and scale of housing development over the period to 2032.</p>	Text amended and expanded
8	<p>Paragraph 3.9</p> <p>The indication is that based on its range of local services and population, the</p>	<p>Please ensure there is a robust evidence base behind the number you</p>	<p>You should have an audit trail of where this minimum number has come from, development plan plus</p>	

	<p>village will be likely to require the BPNP to plan for at least 50 new homes over the plan period. The Core Strategy requires the mix of housing types on schemes to reflect local circumstances, which is expected to remain a requirement as this is consistent with the NPPF.</p>	<p>have arrived at. Even though this to the minimum number of houses to be built, it may come under severe scrutiny, because of your intention to establish a settlement boundary.</p>	<p>the evidence base of the emerging Local Plan i.e. SHMAA 2014. The following extract from your Site Assessment Report provides a good summary of the situation: <i>“Although the Neighbourhood Plan is very likely to be examined and made before the adoption of the new Local Plan, and it will therefore be tested against the strategic provisions of the existing development plan, it can still refer to the evidence of reasoning of emerging strategic policy. In this case, the indication is that the village may need to plan for approximately 50 – 60 homes over the plan period to 2032”</i></p>	
9	<p>Paragraph 3.12 Although these policies now repeat national policy guidance (and so are therefore unlikely to be included in the new Local Plan in these forms), they reinforce the importance of proposals having full regard to heritage assets, whether formally designated or not. The Parish generally, and the village specifically, contains a significant number of listed buildings, as well as</p>	<p>NDPs can direct developers to supplementary planning guidance, in effect raising awareness of guidance tackling specific issues. This however, does not change the status of individual documents.</p>	<p>Paragraph 3.12 Although these policies now repeat national policy guidance (and so are therefore unlikely to be included in the new Local Plan in these forms), they reinforce the importance of proposals having full regard to heritage assets, whether formally designated or not. The Parish generally, and the village specifically, contains a significant</p>	

	<p>two Conservation Areas. These heritage assets will very much shape the site selection and other policies of the BPNP. The BPNP may also define the special character of the local Conservation Areas and raise the status of current supplementary guidance to carry the full weight of the development plan.</p>		<p>number of listed buildings, as well as two Conservation Areas. These heritage assets will very much shape the site selection and other policies of the BPNP. The BPNP may also help define the special character of the local Conservation Areas and guide developers to existing supplementary guidance.</p>	
10	Paragraph 4.4	There is a missing “The” at the start of the sentence.		Text amended
11	<p>Policy BCS1: A Spatial Plan for the Parish <i>The Neighbourhood Plan defines the Brightwell cum Sotwell Village Boundary, as shown on the Policies Map.</i> <i>Proposals for infill development within the boundary will be considered, provided they accord with the design and development management policies of the development plan and other policies of the Neighbourhood Plan.</i> <i>Proposals for development outside the boundary, including within the settlement of Mackney, will only be supported if</i></p>	<p>The Sustainability Appraisal referred to the Judicial Review ruling in relation to the Tattenhall Neighbourhood Plan in May 2014 highlighting the role of community engagement in setting a framework for “deciding the reasonable alternative options for the policies in the Neighbourhood Development Plan and informing the decisions taken on what the draft policies would contain.</p>	<p>Please review and amend this policy and supporting text to address the weaknesses highlighted by the judgment of Patterson J in R (Stonegate Homes) v Horsham DC, 13th October 2016 and the general conformity issue highlighted by the Council.</p> <p>Please review and amend the Preferred Sites Assessment Report to address the concerns raised by the Council. Further guidance on improving the robustness of your site assessment document can be found here</p>	<p>Policy and explanatory text amended. Site Assessment also amended.</p>

	<p><i>they are consistent with local development plan policies on local landscape protection and the protection of the natural environment.</i></p>	<p>The Council welcomes the fact that Brightwell-cum Sotwell Parish Council requested that the Sustainability Appraisal looked at the technical attributes of identified options to enable a comparison.</p> <p>The preferred option defines a settlement boundary, generally welcoming development within and restricting development outside the identified boundary. New housing development is distributed across a range of small sites around the periphery of the village following a number of principles.</p> <p>The identified alternative options (A, B, C and D) mainly differ from the preferred option insofar as it focuses growth on a particular direction, i.e.</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

		<p>South, East, West etc. However, it is not clear whether these alternative options also include a settlement boundary.</p> <p>One clear gap in the assessment is the consideration of the preferred distribution strategy without the settlement boundary as a reasonable alternative. It is also important that assumption about the predicted impacts or benefits of alternatives are backed by evidence.</p> <p>Whilst it is clear that consideration has been given to housing provision within the settlement boundary throughout the plan period, it is not clear what consideration was given to whether other forms of development (i.e. employment, community facilities, etc) could be</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

		<p>accommodated within the boundary.</p> <p>The judgment of Patterson J in R (Stonegate Homes) v Horsham DC, 13th October 2016 is very pertinent to this issue and highlights the issues outlined above. You can find a copy of the decision here.</p> <p>It is also important to note that there are no policies setting settlement development limits within the development plan for the District. Attempting to do so, would result in a less flexible and more restrictive approach to development at the neighbourhood level. This fundamental conflict with the Development Plan's strategic policies could cause this policy to fail to meet basic conditions.</p> <p><u>Preferred sites assessment</u></p>		
--	--	---	--	--

		<p>It is clear that consideration has been given to the availability (although not always clear how this has been established), constraints and potential impact of the assessed sites. However we have not been able to identify how the capacity and viability, which are also key determinants of the suitability and deliverability of these sites, have been assessed, i.e. BcSS03a and BcSS08 are both setting densities well below 25 dwellings per hectare, with the former also requiring mitigation measures.</p> <p>This document is likely to come under a lot of scrutiny. It is important that it is able to demonstrate that the sites have been assessed fairly. Using terms such as “the site sits outside the settlement boundary” or “it is located within the</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

		<p>Green Heart” to explain why the site is unacceptable may be counterproductive. This is because it may give the impression that sites have been selected or excluded solely on the bases of whether they fit within the NDP preferred strategy, without regard to how the sites fare against other criteria.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

<p>General BcS2 BcS14</p>	<p>Historic England</p>	<p>First we are pleased to see this is a well-presented plan with policies that focus on managing land use that are well justified in the supporting text. In preparing the plan the steering group have given particular consideration to the need to conserve the character and appearance of the conservation area and the setting of listed buildings. This is evident in the site allocation policies and policies to guide design of new development and protect the green setting and landscape features of the settlements. It is also evident in the site assessment included in the supporting documents.</p> <p>A point of concern is that, whilst the County Historic Environment Record is referenced as a source of evidence for the plan, we cannot see evidence in the plan that potential impacts of site allocations on archaeological remains has been considered. We would expect to see evidence in the Sustainability appraisal, at least, that the archaeological potential of each site considered for allocation (including those ruled out) has been assessed through examination of the HER records and the review of the area's historic development. This may result in a null result where there is no evidence of archaeological potential, although the course of the Roman road running through the Parish and the medieval origins of the small settlement suggests there is some potential that could be affected.</p> <p>Policy BCS2: Land at Bosely's Orchard and BCS3: Land at Little Martins, etc. We felt that in both cases the phrasing of the policy requiring a variety of architectural style could be tightened a little to reflect the objective to protect the character of the village. We recommend using wording such as: "i. The design of buildings includes a variety of architectural style, materials and forms that reflects the distinctive rural character of buildings seen elsewhere in the village does not follow one particular style, mirroring the eclectic mix of buildings elsewhere in the village; and"</p> <p>Several allocation policies refer to the need to sustain the character of the conservation area or it's setting. We would recommend that, to ensure the plan adds a local aspect to existing policy, the plan is more explicit about what will be necessary to ensure development achieves this aim. Is a</p>	<p>HER records reviewed and appropriate text added to documents</p> <p>Noted and agreed.</p>
-----------------------------------	-----------------------------	--	--

		<p>particular scale, or mix of scales required or could this requirement be supported by reference to the conservation area appraisal, character assessment or design guide? We recommend that policy requirements such as this, are as specific as possible to ensure that the plan effectively conveys local understanding of what is required to make development acceptable. At present this requirement does not add anything to decision making that is not already required by existing local and national planning policy or legislation.</p> <p>Policy BCS14: The plan needs to define better what solar energy developments need to be screened from. This is a relatively imprecise phrasing at present, although we would support a policy that identifies the need to avoid or minimise solar development having a jarring or incongruous impact in views either to or from heritage assets, and in particular in views across the rural landscape area south and west of the conservation area identified earlier in the plan as making an important contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area.</p>	<p>Noted and agreed</p> <p>Text amended</p> <p>Text amended</p>
--	--	---	---

<p>General BcS10 BcS11 BcS12 BcS2 BcS3 BcS3 BcS4 BcS5</p>	<p>Nat Eng</p>	<p>In our review of the Pre-Submission Report we would like to commend the policies supporting connected wildlife corridors as part of development in the parish. Connected open greenspace, wild greenspace and green infrastructure can all be used to create connected habitat suitable for species adaptation to climate change. We also support the green infrastructure policies including BSC10 Local green spaces, BSC11 Trees, hedgerows and wildlife corridors and BSC12 Footpaths and bridleways.</p> <p>We would like to see an explicit biodiversity policy covering biodiversity ‘net gain’ for all development as part of the Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity Policies section. It would also be advisable to state in Landscape Policies section that no development is planned within the North Wessex Downs AONB.</p> <p>Policies BCS2-BCS5 all propose development on greenspace or wild habitat</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted see NP evidence base.</p> <p>Noted</p>
---	----------------	---	--

		<p>areas within the new settlement boundary. This will result in a significant loss of biodiversity within the parish if not sufficiently mitigated. Each of these policies should include an explicit statement requiring development proposals to have a biodiversity 'net gain' for the parish. Suitable methods for assessing biodiversity impacts can include the Defra biodiversity offsetting metric¹ and the environment bank biodiversity impact calculator².</p> <p>The number of sites proposed is also of concern but may provide some opportunities. The housing need assessment concluded a need of 50 new homes. Policies BCS2-BCS5 allow for at least 61 homes but more likely around 70 homes including the undefined allocation at BCS5a. It would therefore be possible to allocate more area to connected greenspace to compensate for the impacts of development.</p>	<p>NP Policies and discussions with developers are seeking to achieve this where possible.</p>
	Nat Eng	<p>Policy BCS2 allocates land directly adjacent to the North Wessex Downs AONB. Policy BCS3 allocates land on the edge of the settlement facing the AONB. The Neighbourhood Plan states often that the village is invisible in the landscape. This attribute would need to continue for the development at Bosley's Orchard and Little Martins Home Farm Barns not to have an impact on the AONB. A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) should be carried out for these sites. We refer you to the Landscape Institute Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment for further guidance. If this assessment is unfeasible within the Neighbourhood Plan then a LVIA needs to be included as an explicit policy requirement for the future development of these sites</p>	<p>Please refer to evidence base. Each site will be considered through individual planning applications.</p>

Draft Sustainability Assessment	Nat Eng	<p>The Draft Sustainability report focuses heavily on the provision of housing with less of a focus on the environmental impacts. However, with a few added paragraphs and policies on visual landscape impact assessment and biodiversity 'net gain' this could be easily rectified.</p> <p>Table E has no effect (0) on the landscape for policies BCS2 and BCS3. It is</p>	Noted
---------------------------------	---------	---	-------

		<p>our opinion that not enough assessment has been conducted to conclude no visual landscape impacts on the AONB. These should be changed to 0/- (which I am assuming is no impact / negative impacts). There is no key to this table's symbols.</p> <p>Paragraph 8.6 states; "...in consolidating new development within the main village form and not requiring further extensions into the landscape, the policy avoids a negative landscape effect...". The proposed development site at Little Martins (BCS3) is on the western edge of the settlement and extends the urban footprint into the rural landscape. Together with Thornes Nursery (BCS4) they take up a large area of green space with possible views both towards the AONB and from within the AONB into the development site. More detail needs to be provided as to how visual landscape impacts will be avoided at this site.</p> <p>The majority of visual landscape impacts and mitigation options can be assessed with an LVIA. We recommend that one is undertaken as part of the SEA. If this is not feasible, then an explicit requirement for a LVIA to be undertaken as part of any development application should be included in the policies of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>The assessment of Policies BCS2-BCS5 requires more detail on how visual landscape impacts and biodiversity impacts will be avoided, then mitigated. Paragraph 8.8 states "At Bosley's Orchard (BCS2), the policy avoids a negative biodiversity effect by requiring land is used to deliver a biodiversity gain in the wide landscape buffer adjoining the Style Acre footpath". Style Acre footpath is located along the eastern edge of the site. The AONB is along the northern edge of the site. This buffer will not mitigate the visual impacts to the AONB and may block the views of the AONB from the surrounding homes. As an assessment of the visual impacts have not been provided no conclusions can be made. Also, while this landscape buffer may provide a some increase in biodiversity to offset the clearing of the rest of the site there is no specific policy</p>	<p>Noted a key will be added.</p> <p>Noted – these issues will be considered through individual planning applications.</p> <p>Agreed</p> <p>Noted requirement for VLIA and Biodiversity net gain to be added. Each site will then be considered through individual planning applications.</p> <p>Noted</p>
--	--	---	--

		<p>requiring a biodiversity 'net gain' for development within the parish so again no conclusions can be made.</p> <p>Paragraph 8.10 covers details of how heritage impacts will be mitigated but not how biodiversity impacts will be dealt with. The inclusion of a policy that requires any development to provide a biodiversity 'net gain' within the parish would satisfy this requirement.</p>	
--	--	--	--

	EA	<p>We are pleased to see that the proposed allocations have been directed to the areas at the lowest probability of flooding and that they are all located within Flood Zone 1.</p> <p>South Oxfordshire District Council and/or Oxfordshire County Council (as the Lead Local Flood Authority) will be able to advise if there are areas at risk from 'local' sources of flood risk (including surface water, groundwater and sewerage flood risk) in your neighbourhood plan area. Any relevant Surface Water Management Plans will contain recommendations and actions about how such sites can help reduce the risk of flooding. This may be useful when developing policies or guidance for particular sites.</p>	Noted
--	----	--	-------

Appendix A

Responses from statutory consultees

- South Oxfordshire District Council
- Historic England
- Natural England
- Environment Agency
- Oxfordshire County Council (received after closing date)

Planning services

HEAD OF SERVICE: ADRIAN DUFFIELD



Listening Learning Leading

Lucy Dalby

By email only:

bcsparishcouncil@googlemail.com

Contact officer: Ricardo Rios

Ricardo.rios@southandvale.gov.uk

Tel: 01235 422600

Cc: Jason Debney

11 January 2017

Dear Ms Dalby

Brightwell-cum-Sotwell Neighbourhood Development Plan - Pre-Submission Consultation

Thank you for taking the time to meet with me in person to discuss the progress and aspirations of your draft Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) in person and for giving the Council the opportunity to comment on your NDP.

Having now seen a complete draft, along with some of the evidence, we are able to offer formal advice compiled from across the Council, under our duty to support neighbourhood plans. Our response focusses on helping the plan meet the basic conditions as specified by the regulations.

To communicate our response in a simple and positive manner; we produced a table containing an identification number for each comment, a copy of the relevant section/policy of the NDP, our comments and, where possible, a recommendation.

Our comments at this stage are merely a constructive contribution to the process and should not be interpreted as the Council's formal view about whether the draft plan meets the basic conditions.



	Section/Policy	Comment	Recommendation
1	<p>Foreword – Paragraph 5 and 8</p> <p><u>Paragraph 5</u></p> <p>The parish retains many facilities such as a pub, a shop (with a post office), a school, the village pub, village hall, a riverside hotel, several garages and an award winning vineyard...</p> <p><u>Paragraph 8</u></p> <p>To meet the parish’s housing needs and to guide sustainable development, it was agreed in 2013 at the Brightwell cum Sotwell Parish Meeting to develop a Neighbourhood Plan. The Parish Council established a sub-group to consult on and produce a neighbourhood plan with the intention that following referendum the Brightwell cum Sotwell Neighbourhood Plan will form part of South Oxfordshire District Council’s local plan to guide development within our parish.</p>	<p><u>Paragraph 5</u></p> <p>This section lists pub twice.</p> <p><u>Paragraph 8</u></p> <p>The South Oxfordshire District Council’s local plan is one of a series of documents which alongside neighbourhood plans form part of the Development Plan for the District.</p>	<p><u>Paragraph 5</u></p> <p>If the intention is to refer to two pubs, this should be clarified.</p> <p><u>Paragraph 8</u></p> <p>Amend section to:</p> <p>To meet the parish’s housing needs and to guide sustainable development, it was agreed in 2013 at the Brightwell cum Sotwell Parish Meeting to develop a Neighbourhood Plan. The Parish Council established a sub-group to consult on and produce a neighbourhood plan with the intention that following referendum the Brightwell cum Sotwell Neighbourhood Plan will form part of South Oxfordshire’s Development Plan and will guide development within our parish.</p>
2	<p>Vision – Page 5 and Paragraph 5.1</p> <p>The Vision for Brightwell is: <i>“To retain our separate identity as a rural</i></p>	<p>It is important to take every opportunity to demonstrate/express that the NDP has looked at the neighbourhood area as a whole.</p>	<p>Amend section to:</p> <p>5.1 The Vision for Brightwell-cum-Sotwell is:</p>

	<i>parish set within open countryside, conserving the character of the various settlements; in a way that allows the community to evolve whilst sustaining our core vital services”</i>		<i>“To retain our separate identity as a rural parish set within open countryside, conserving the character of the various settlements; in a way that allows the community to evolve whilst sustaining our core vital services”</i>
3	<p>Paragraph 1.2</p> <p>The purpose of the Brightwell cum Sotwell Parish Neighbourhood Plan (BPNP) is to make planning policies that can be used to determine planning applications in the area in the period to March 2032. Its policies aim to positively plan for the growth of the main village but to do in ways that will protect the special character of the Parish.</p>	<p>It is important that neighbourhood plans use positive language to ensure that changes which could improve and enhance the neighbourhood plan area are not discouraged.</p>	<p>Amend section to:</p> <p>The purpose of the Brightwell cum Sotwell Parish Neighbourhood Plan (BPNP) is to make planning policies that can be used to determine planning applications in the area in the period to March 2032. Its policies aim to positively plan for the growth of the main village but to do in ways that will protect and enhance the special character of the Parish.</p>
4	<p>Paragraph 1.7</p> <p>These requirements will be tested by an independent examiner once the Neighbourhood Plan is finalised. If satisfied, the examiner will recommend that the plan goes to referendum of the local electorate. If a simple majority of the turnout votes for the Plan, then it becomes adopted as formal planning policy for the area.</p>	<p>It is important to make clear that the independent examiner’s report is not legally binding on the Council and that currently NDPs do not automatically become a statutory document following the referendum.</p>	<p>Amend section to:</p> <p>These requirements will be tested by an independent examiner once the Neighbourhood Plan is finalised. If satisfied, the examiner will recommend that South Oxfordshire District Council should progress the plan to a referendum of the local electorate. If the Council decides to progress the plan to a referendum, and a simple majority of the turnout votes in favour the Plan, the</p>

			Council must adopt it as formal planning policy for the area, so long as the plan doesn't breach EU Regulations.
5	<p>Paragraph 3.2</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) published by the government in 2012 is an important guide in the preparation of local plans and neighbourhood plans. The BPNP must demonstrate that it is consistent with the provisions of the NPPF. The following paragraphs of the NPPF are especially relevant to the BPNP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supporting a prosperous rural economy (paragraph 28) • Good Design (paragraph 58) • Protecting healthy communities (paragraph 70) • Protecting local green spaces (paragraph 76) • Conserving and enhancing the natural environment (paragraph 109) • Conserving and enhancing the historic environment (paragraph 126) • Neighbourhood planning (paragraph 185) 	It is important that readers are made aware that the plan is consistent with the NPPF as a whole.	<p>Amend section to:</p> <p>3.2 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) published by the government in 2012 is an important guide in the preparation of local plans and neighbourhood plans. The BPNP must demonstrate that it is consistent with the provisions of the NPPF as a whole. The following paragraphs of the NPPF are especially relevant to the issues addressed by the BPNP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supporting a prosperous rural economy (paragraph 28) • Good Design (paragraph 58) • Protecting healthy communities (paragraph 70) • Protecting local green spaces (paragraph 76) • Conserving and enhancing the natural environment (paragraph 109) • Conserving and enhancing the historic environment (paragraph 126) • Neighbourhood planning (paragraph 185)

6	<p>Paragraph 3.5</p> <p>The essence of the overall planning strategy for the District has been and will continue to be to focus development on the main towns and larger villages of the District and to maintain the rural character of the open countryside that makes up the majority of the area. The Parish does not lie within an area planned for growth and is currently considered a ‘smaller village’.</p>	<p>It is important that we take any opportunity to show that the NDP views appropriate development in a positive light. The NPPF support for prosperous rural communities envisages a level of growth, the local policy context indicates that this level of growth should be limited or lesser than the levels expected for larger villages and towns.</p>	<p>Amend section to:</p> <p>3.5 The essence of the overall planning strategy for the District has been and will continue to be to focus development on the main towns and larger villages of the District and to maintain the rural character of the open countryside that makes up the majority of the area. The Parish does not lie within an area planned for significant growth and is currently considered a ‘smaller village’.</p>
7	<p>Paragraph 3.8</p> <p>More generally, the housing supply strategy of the Core Strategy is deemed out of date by §49 of the NPPF, given the District Council cannot demonstrate it has a five year supply of housing land, and this is unlikely to change until the new Local Plan is adopted. The new strategy proposes a significant increase in the pace and scale of housing development over the period to 2032.</p>	<p>It is necessary to add the word “currently” to make the description of the District’s housing land supply position factually accurate.</p>	<p>Amend section to:</p> <p>More generally, the housing supply strategy of the Core Strategy is currently deemed out of date by §49 of the NPPF, given the District Council cannot demonstrate it has a five year supply of housing land, and this is unlikely to change until the new Local Plan is adopted. The new strategy proposes a significant increase in the pace and scale of housing development over the period to 2032.</p>
8	<p>Paragraph 3.9</p> <p>The indication is that based on its range of local services and population, the village will be likely to require the BPNP to plan for at</p>	<p>Please ensure there is a robust evidence base behind the number you have arrived at.</p> <p>Even though this to the minimum number of houses to be built, it may come under severe scrutiny, because of your</p>	<p>You should have an audit trail of where this minimum number has come from, development plan plus the evidence base of the emerging Local Plan i.e. SHMAA</p>

	<p>least 50 new homes over the plan period. The Core Strategy requires the mix of housing types on schemes to reflect local circumstances, which is expected to remain a requirement as this is consistent with the NPPF.</p>	<p>intention to establish a settlement boundary.</p>	<p>2014.</p> <p>The following extract from your Site Assessment Report provides a good summary of the situation:</p> <p><i>“Although the Neighbourhood Plan is very likely to be examined and made before the adoption of the new Local Plan, and it will therefore be tested against the strategic provisions of the existing development plan, it can still refer to the evidence of reasoning of emerging strategic policy. In this case, the indication is that the village may need to plan for approximately 50 – 60 homes over the plan period to 2032”</i></p>
9	<p>Paragraph 3.12</p> <p>Although these policies now repeat national policy guidance (and so are therefore unlikely to be included in the new Local Plan in these forms), they reinforce the importance of proposals having full regard to heritage assets, whether formally designated or not. The Parish generally, and the village specifically, contains a significant number of listed buildings, as well as two Conservation Areas.</p>	<p>NDPs can direct developers to supplementary planning guidance, in effect raising awareness of guidance tackling specific issues. This however, does not change the status of individual documents.</p>	<p>Paragraph 3.12</p> <p>Although these policies now repeat national policy guidance (and so are therefore unlikely to be included in the new Local Plan in these forms), they reinforce the importance of proposals having full regard to heritage assets, whether formally designated or not. The Parish generally, and the village specifically, contains a significant number</p>

	<p>These heritage assets will very much shape the site selection and other policies of the BPNP. The BPNP may also define the special character of the local Conservation Areas and raise the status of current supplementary guidance to carry the full weight of the development plan.</p>		<p>of listed buildings, as well as two Conservation Areas.</p> <p>These heritage assets will very much shape the site selection and other policies of the BPNP. The BPNP may also help define the special character of the local Conservation Areas and guide developers to existing supplementary guidance.</p>
10	Paragraph 4.4	There is a missing “The” at the start of the sentence.	
11	<p>Policy BCS1: A Spatial Plan for the Parish <i>The Neighbourhood Plan defines the Brightwell cum Sotwell Village Boundary, as shown on the Policies Map.</i> <i>Proposals for infill development within the boundary will be considered, provided they accord with the design and development management policies of the development plan and other policies of the Neighbourhood Plan.</i> <i>Proposals for development outside the boundary, including within the settlement of Mackney, will only be supported if they are consistent with local development plan policies on local landscape protection and the protection of the natural environment.</i></p>	<p>The Sustainability Appraisal referred to the Judicial Review ruling in relation to the Tattenhall Neighbourhood Plan in May 2014 highlighting the role of community engagement in setting a framework for “<i>deciding the reasonable alternative options for the policies in the Neighbourhood Development Plan and informing the decisions taken on what the draft policies would contain.</i>”</p> <p>The Council welcomes the fact that Brightwell-cum Sotwell Parish Council requested that the Sustainability Appraisal looked at the technical attributes of identified options to enable a comparison.</p> <p>The preferred option defines a settlement boundary, generally welcoming development within and restricting development outside the identified boundary. New housing development is distributed across a range of small</p>	<p>Please review and amend this policy and supporting text to address the weaknesses highlighted by the judgment of Patterson J in R (Stonegate Homes) v Horsham DC, 13th October 2016 and the general conformity issue highlighted by the Council.</p> <p>Please review and amend the Preferred Sites Assessment Report to address the concerns raised by the Council.</p> <p>Further guidance on improving the robustness of your site assessment document can be found here</p>

		<p>sites around the periphery of the village following a number of principles.</p> <p>The identified alternative options (A, B, C and D) mainly differ from the preferred option insofar as it focuses growth on a particular direction, i.e. South, East, West etc. However, it is not clear whether these alternative options also include a settlement boundary.</p> <p>One clear gap in the assessment is the consideration of the preferred distribution strategy without the settlement boundary as a reasonable alternative. It is also important that assumption about the predicted impacts or benefits of alternatives are backed by evidence.</p> <p>Whilst it is clear that consideration has been given to housing provision within the settlement boundary throughout the plan period, it is not clear what consideration was given to whether other forms of development (i.e. employment, community facilities, etc) could be accommodated within the boundary.</p> <p>The judgment of Patterson J in R (Stonegate Homes) v Horsham DC, 13th October 2016 is very pertinent to this issue and highlights the issues outlined above. You can find a copy of the decision here.</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>It is also important to note that there are no policies setting settlement development limits within the development plan for the District. Attempting to do so, would result in a less flexible and more restrictive approach to development at the neighbourhood level. This fundamental conflict with the Development Plan’s strategic policies could cause this policy to fail to meet basic conditions.</p> <p><u>Preferred sites assessment</u></p> <p>It is clear that consideration has been given to the availability (although not always clear how this has been established), constraints and potential impact of the assessed sites. However we have not been able to identify how the capacity and viability, which are also key determinants of the suitability and deliverability of these sites, have been assessed, i.e. BcSS03a and BcSS08 are both setting densities well below 25 dwellings per hectare, with the former also requiring mitigation measures.</p> <p>This document is likely to come under a lot of scrutiny. It is important that it is able to demonstrate that the sites have been assessed fairly. Using terms such as “the site sits outside the settlement boundary” or “it is located within the Green Heart” to explain why the site is unacceptable may be counterproductive. This is because it may give the</p>	
--	--	---	--

		impression that sites have been selected or excluded solely on the bases of whether they fit within the NDP preferred strategy, without regard to how the sites fare against other criteria.	
--	--	--	--



Historic England

Lucy Dalby

Parish Clerk

The Parish Office, The Village Hall, West End,
Brightwell cum Sotwell

Our ref: 2017.01.11
Your ref: Brightwell NP
Pre-
submission HE
RLS
Comments
01483 252028

bcsparishcouncil@googlemail.com By email only

Telephone

Fax

11th January 2017

Re: Brightwell cum Sotwell Neighbourhood Plan Pre-submission Version

Thank you for consulting Historic England on the Brightwell-cum-Sotwell Neighbourhood Plan. As the government's advisor on planning for the Historic Environment Historic England's remit is to consider what effects the plan will have for the conservation and enjoyment of heritage assets or the delivery of well designed development in historic places. As such we have restricted our comments to these areas of the plan.

First we are pleased to see this is a well-presented plan with policies that focus on managing land use that are well justified in the supporting text. In preparing the plan the steering group have given particular consideration to the need to conserve the character and appearance of the conservation area and the setting of listed buildings. This is evident in the site allocation policies and policies to guide design of new development and protect the green setting and landscape features of the settlements. It is also evident in the site assessment included in the supporting documents.

A point of concern is that, whilst the County Historic Environment Record is referenced as a source of evidence for the plan, we cannot see evidence in the plan that potential impacts of site allocations on archaeological remains has been

considered. We would expect to see evidence in the Sustainability appraisal, at least, that the archaeological potential of each site considered for allocation (including those ruled out) has been assessed through examination of the HER records and the review of the area's historic development. This may result in a null result where there is no evidence of archaeological potential, although the course of the Roman road running through the Parish and the medieval origins of the small settlement suggests there is some potential that could be affected.

Policy BCS2: Land at Bosely's Orchard and BCS3: Land at Little Martins, etc.

We felt that in both cases the phrasing of the policy requiring a variety of architectural style could be tightened a little to reflect the objective to protect the character of the village. We recommend using wording such as:

"i. The design of buildings **includes a variety of architectural style, materials and forms that reflects the distinctive rural character of buildings seen elsewhere in the village** ~~does not follow one particular style, mirroring the eclectic mix of buildings elsewhere in the village;~~ and"

Several allocation policies refer to the need to sustain the character of the conservation area or its setting. We would recommend that, to ensure the plan adds a local aspect to existing policy, the plan is more explicit about what will be necessary to ensure development achieves this aim. Is a particular scale, or mix of scales required or could this requirement be supported by reference to the conservation area appraisal, character assessment or design guide? We recommend that policy requirements such as this, are as specific as possible to ensure that the plan effectively conveys local understanding of what is required to make development acceptable. At present this requirement does not add anything to decision making that is not already required by existing local and national planning policy or legislation.

Policy BCS14: The plan needs to define better what solar energy developments need to be screened from. This is a relatively imprecise phrasing at present, although we would support a policy that identifies the need to avoid or minimise solar development having a jarring or incongruous impact in views either to or from heritage assets, and in particular in views across the rural landscape area south and west of the conservation area identified earlier in the plan as making an important contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area.

We hope these comments are helpful but would be pleased to answer any queries you may have about them or to provide further information that may be needed

Date: 03 January 2017

Our ref: 202244

The Parish Office

The Village Hall

West End

Brightwell cum Sotwell

OX10 0RY

BY EMAIL ONLY

Dear Lucy Dalby



Customer Services
Hornbeam House
Crewe Business Park
Electra Way
Crewe
Cheshire
CW1 6GJ

T 0300 060 3900

Planning Consultation: Brightwell-cum-Sotwell Neighbourhood Plan Pre-Submission Report and the Draft Sustainability Appraisal Report.

Thank you for your consultation on the above dated 23th November 2016.

Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.

Natural England is a statutory consultee in neighbourhood planning and must be consulted on draft neighbourhood development plans by the Parish/Town Councils or Neighbourhood Forums where our interests would be affected by the policies made.

Brightwell-cum-Sotwell Neighbourhood Plan Pre-Submission Report

In our review of the Pre-Submission Report we would like to commend the policies supporting connected wildlife corridors as part of development in the parish. Connected open greenspace, wild greenspace and green infrastructure can all be used to create connected habitat suitable for species adaptation to climate change. We also support the green infrastructure policies including BSC10 Local green spaces, BSC11 Trees, hedgerows and wildlife corridors and BSC12 Footpaths and bridleways.

We would like to see an explicit biodiversity policy covering biodiversity 'net gain' for all development as part of the Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity Policies section. It would also be advisable to state in Landscape Policies section that no development is planned within the North Wessex Downs AONB.

Policies BCS2-BCS5 all propose development on greenspace or wild habitat areas within the new settlement boundary. This will result in a significant loss of biodiversity within the parish if not sufficiently mitigated. Each of these policies should include an explicit statement requiring development proposals to have a biodiversity 'net gain' for the parish. Suitable methods for assessing biodiversity impacts can include the Defra biodiversity offsetting metric¹ and the environment bank biodiversity impact calculator².

The number of sites proposed is also of concern but may provide some opportunities. The housing need assessment concluded a need of 50 new homes. Policies BCS2-BCS5 allow for at least 61 homes but more likely around 70 homes including the undefined allocation at BSC5a. It would

¹ <https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/biodiversity-offsetting#guidance-for-offset-providers-developers-and-local-authorities-in-the-pilotareas> Note; the 'Guidance for developers' and 'Guidance for offset providers' documents provide a calculation method.

² <http://www.environmentbank.com/impact-calculator.php> , and http://www.google.co.uk/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=3&ved=0ahUKEwj7vcbI0aDQAhVMDcAKHb8IDEUQFggSMAJ&url=http%3A%2F%2Fconsult.welhat.gov.uk%2Ffile%2F4184236&usq=AFQjCNFfbJJQ_UN0044Qe6rmiLffxckg

therefore be possible to allocate more area to connected greenspace to compensate for the impacts of development.

Policy BCS2 allocates land directly adjacent to the North Wessex Downs AONB. Policy BCS3 allocates land on the edge of the settlement facing the AONB. The Neighbourhood Plan states often that the village is invisible in the landscape. This attribute would need to continue for the development at Bosley's Orchard and Little Martins Home Farm Barns not to have an impact on the AONB. A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) should be carried out for these sites. We refer you to the [Landscape Institute](#) Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment for further guidance. If this assessment is unfeasible within the Neighbourhood Plan then a LVIA needs to be included as an explicit policy requirement for the future development of these sites.

One final small thing, the pictures and maps within the report are of a very poor quality. It was hard to comment on some of the information shown in them.

Draft Sustainability Appraisal Report

The Draft Sustainability report focuses heavily on the provision of housing with less of a focus on the environmental impacts. However, with a few added paragraphs and policies on visual landscape impact assessment and biodiversity 'net gain' this could be easily rectified.

Table E has no effect (0) on the landscape for policies BCS2 and BCS3. It is our opinion that not enough assessment has been conducted to conclude no visual landscape impacts on the AONB. These should be changed to 0/- (which I am assuming is no impact / negative impacts). There is no key to this table's symbols.

Paragraph 8.6 states; *"...in consolidating new development within the main village form and not requiring further extensions into the landscape, the policy avoids a negative landscape effect..."*. The proposed development site at Little Martins (BCS3) is on the western edge of the settlement and extends the urban footprint into the rural landscape. Together with Thornes Nursery (BCS4) they take up a large area of green space with possible views both towards the AONB and from within the AONB into the development site. More detail needs to be provided as to how visual landscape impacts will be avoided at this site.

The majority of visual landscape impacts and mitigation options can be assessed with an LVIA. We recommend that one is undertaken as part of the SEA. If this is not feasible, then an explicit requirement for a LVIA to be undertaken as part of any development application should be included in the policies of the Neighbourhood Plan.

The assessment of Policies BCS2-BCS5 requires more detail on how visual landscape impacts and biodiversity impacts will be avoided, then mitigated. Paragraph 8.8 states *"At Bosley's Orchard (BCS2), the policy avoids a negative biodiversity effect by requiring land is used to deliver a biodiversity gain in the wide landscape buffer adjoining the Style Acre footpath"*. Style Acre footpath is located along the eastern edge of the site. The AONB is along the northern edge of the

site. This buffer will not mitigate the visual impacts to the AONB and may block the views of the AONB from the surrounding homes. As an assessment of the visual impacts have not been provided no conclusions can be made. Also, while this landscape buffer may provide a some increase in biodiversity to offset the clearing of the rest of the site there is no specific policy requiring a biodiversity 'net gain' for development within the parish so again no conclusions can be made.

Paragraph 8.10 covers details of how heritage impacts will be mitigated but not how biodiversity impacts will be dealt with. The inclusion of a policy that requires any development to provide a biodiversity 'net gain' within the parish would satisfy this requirement.

For clarification of any points in this letter, please contact Kirsty Macpherson on 07775543864. If you would like to arrange a meeting to discuss your neighbourhood plan or other environmental planning for your community I would be happy to attend.

We really value your feedback to help us improve the service we offer. We have attached a feedback form to this letter and welcome any comments you might have about our service.

Yours sincerely

Kirsty Macpherson

Lead Adviser

Sustainable Development

Thames Team

Annex 1 - Neighbourhood planning and the natural environment: information, issues and opportunities

Natural Environment Information Sources

The [Magic](#)³ website will provide you with much of the nationally held natural environment data for your plan area. The most relevant layers for you to consider are: **Agricultural Land Classification, Ancient Woodland, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, Local Nature Reserves, National Parks (England), National Trails, Priority Habitat Inventory, public rights of way (on the Ordnance Survey base map) and Sites of Special Scientific Interest (including their impact risk zones)**. Local environmental record centres may hold a range of additional information on the natural environment. A list of local record centres is available [here](#)⁴.

Priority habitats are those habitats of particular importance for nature conservation, and the list of them can be found [here](#)⁵. Most of these will be mapped either as **Sites of Special Scientific Interest**, on the Magic website or as **Local Wildlife Sites**. Your local planning authority should be able to supply you with the locations of Local Wildlife Sites.

National Character Areas (NCAs) divide England into 159 distinct natural areas. Each character area is defined by a unique combination of landscape, biodiversity, geodiversity and cultural and economic activity. NCA profiles contain descriptions of the area and statements of environmental opportunity, which may be useful to inform proposals in your plan. NCA information can be found [here](#)⁶.

There may also be a local **landscape character assessment** covering your area. This is a tool to help understand the character and local distinctiveness of the landscape and identify the features that give it a sense of place. It can help to inform, plan and manage change in the area. Your local planning authority should be able to help you access these if you can't find them online.

If your neighbourhood planning area is within or adjacent to a **National Park or Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty** (AONB), the relevant National Park/AONB Management Plan for the area will set out useful information about the protected landscape. You can access the plans on from the relevant National Park Authority or Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty website.

General mapped information on **soil types** and **Agricultural Land Classification** is available (under

'landscape') on the [Magic](#)⁷ website and also from the [LandIS website](#)⁷, which contains more information about obtaining soil data.

³ <http://magic.defra.gov.uk/>

⁴ <http://www.nbn-nfbr.org.uk/nfbr.php>

⁵

<http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20140711133551/http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/ourwork/conservation/biodiversity/protectandmanage/habsandspeciesimportance.aspx>

⁶ <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-character-area-profiles-data-for-local-decision-making> ⁷ <http://magic.defra.gov.uk/>

⁷ <http://www.landis.org.uk/index.cfm>

Natural Environment Issues to Consider

The [National Planning Policy Framework](#)⁸⁹ sets out national planning policy on protecting and enhancing the natural environment. [Planning Practice Guidance](#)¹⁰ sets out supporting guidance.

Your local planning authority should be able to provide you with further advice on the potential impacts of your plan or order on the natural environment and the need for any environmental assessments.

Landscape

Your plans or orders may present opportunities to protect and enhance locally valued landscapes. You may want to consider identifying distinctive local landscape features or characteristics such as ponds, woodland or dry stone walls and think about how any new development proposals can respect and enhance local landscape character and distinctiveness.

If you are proposing development within or close to a protected landscape (National Park or Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty) or other sensitive location, we recommend that you carry out a landscape assessment of the proposal. Landscape assessments can help you to choose the most appropriate sites for development and help to avoid or minimise impacts of development on the landscape through careful siting, design and landscaping.

Wildlife habitats

Some proposals can have adverse impacts on designated wildlife sites or other priority habitats (listed [here](#)¹¹), such as Sites of Special Scientific Interest or [Ancient woodland](#)¹². If there are likely to be any adverse impacts you'll need to think about how such impacts can be avoided, mitigated or, as a last resort, compensated for.

Priority and protected species and habitat

You'll also want to consider whether any proposals might affect priority species (listed [here](#)¹³) or protected species. To help you do this, Natural England has produced advice [here](#)¹⁴ to help understand the impact of particular developments on protected species. Consideration should also be given to the potential environmental value of brownfield sites, often found in urban areas and former industrial land, further information including links to the open mosaic habitats inventory can be found [here](#).

Ancient woodland and veteran trees-link to standing advice

You should consider any impacts on ancient woodland and veteran trees in line with paragraph 118 of the NPPF. Natural England maintains the Ancient Woodland [Inventory](#) which can help identify ancient woodland. Natural England and the Forest Commission have produced [standing advice](#) for planning authorities in relation to ancient woodland and veteran trees. It should be taken into account by planning authorities when determining relevant planning applications. Natural England will only provide bespoke advice on ancient woodland/veteran trees where they form part of a SSSI or in exceptional circumstances

⁸ <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-framework--2>

⁹ <http://planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk/blog/guidance/natural-environment/>

Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land

Soil is a finite resource that fulfils many important functions and services for society. It is a growing medium for food, timber and other crops, a store for carbon and water, a reservoir of biodiversity and a buffer against pollution. If you are proposing development, you should seek to use areas of poorer quality agricultural land in preference to that of a higher quality in line with National Planning Policy Framework para 112. For more information, see our publication [Agricultural Land Classification: protecting the best and most versatile agricultural land](#)¹⁵.

Green Infrastructure, Improving Your Natural Environment.

Your plan or order can offer exciting opportunities to enhance your local environment through inclusion of green infrastructure (GI). If you are setting out policies on new development or proposing sites for

¹¹ <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20140711133551/http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/ourwork/conservation/biodiversity/protectandmanage/habsandspeciesimportance.aspx>

¹² <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/ancient-woodland-and-veteran-trees-protection-surveys-licences>

¹³ <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20140711133551/http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/ourwork/conservation/biodiversity/protectandmanage/habsandspeciesimportance.aspx>

¹⁴ <https://www.gov.uk/protected-species-and-sites-how-to-review-planning-proposals>

¹⁵ <http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/35012>

development, you may wish to consider identifying what environmental features you want to be retained, connected, enhanced or new features you would like to see created as part of any new development. Examples might include:

- Providing a new footpath with landscaping through the new development to link into existing rights of way or other green spaces.
- Restoring a neglected hedgerow or create new ones.
- Creating a new pond as an attractive feature on the site.
- Planting trees characteristic to the local area to make a positive contribution to the local landscape.
- Using native plants in landscaping schemes for better nectar and seed sources for bees and birds.
- Incorporating swift boxes or bat boxes into the design of new buildings.
- Think about how lighting can be best managed to encourage wildlife.
- Adding a green roof to new buildings.

You may also want to consider enhancing your local area in other ways, for example by:

- Setting out in your plan how you would like to implement elements of a wider Green Infrastructure Strategy (if one exists for the Aylesbury Vale District) in your community.
- Assessing needs for accessible greenspace and setting out proposals to address any deficiencies or enhance provision.
- Identifying green areas of particular importance for special protection through Local Green Space designation (see [Planning Practice Guidance on this](#)¹⁶).
- Managing existing (and new) public spaces to be more wildlife friendly (e.g. by sowing wild flower strips in less used parts of parks, changing hedge cutting timings and frequency).
- Planting additional street trees.

- Identifying any improvements to the existing public right of way network, e.g. cutting back hedges, improving the surface, clearing litter or installing kissing gates) or extending the network to create missing links.
- Restoring neglected environmental features (e.g. coppicing a prominent hedge that is in poor condition or clearing away an eyesore).

Green Roofs

Natural England is supportive of the inclusion of living roofs in all appropriate development. Research indicates that the benefits of green roofs include reducing run-off and thereby the risk of surface water flooding; reducing the requirement for heating and air-conditioning; and providing habitat for wildlife.

We would advise your council that some living roofs, such as sedum matting, can have limited biodiversity value in terms of the range of species that grow on them and habitats they provide. Natural England would encourage you to consider the use of bespoke solutions based on the needs of the wildlife specific to the site and adjacent area. I would refer you to <http://livingroofs.org/> for a range of innovative solutions.

¹⁶ <http://planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk/blog/guidance/open-space-sports-and-recreation-facilities-public-rights-ofway-and-local-green-space/local-green-space-designation/>

Lucy Dalby
Parish Clerk
Brightwell-cum-Sotwell Parish Council
The Village Hall
West End
Brightwell-cum-Sotwell
Oxfordshire
OX10 0RY

Our ref: WA/2006/000324/OT-10/SB1-L01

Date: 9 January 2017

Dear Lucy,

Brightwell-cum-Sotwell Pre-Submission Neighbourhood Plan

Thank you for consulting the Environment Agency on the Draft Neighbourhood Plan for Brightwell-cum-Sotwell.

We aim to reduce flood risk, while protecting and enhancing the water environment. We have had to focus our detailed engagement to those areas where the environmental risks are greatest.

Based on the environmental constraints within the area, we have no detailed comments to make in relation to your Plan at this stage. However, further guidance can be found on the gov.uk website at: <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/consulting-on-neighbourhood-plans-and-development-orders>.

We are pleased to see that the proposed allocations have been directed to the areas at the lowest probability of flooding and that they are all located within Flood Zone 1.

South Oxfordshire District Council and/or Oxfordshire County Council (as the Lead Local Flood Authority) will be able to advise if there are areas at risk from 'local' sources of flood risk (including surface water, groundwater and sewerage flood risk) in your neighbourhood plan area. Any relevant Surface Water Management Plans will contain recommendations and actions about how such sites can help reduce the risk of flooding. This may be useful when developing policies or guidance for particular sites.

If you have any queries about this response, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely,

Clark Gordon
Sustainable Places Planning Specialist

Direct dial 0203 025 8998

E-mail planning-wallington@environment-agency.gov.uk

cc Planning Policy – South Oxfordshire District Council

Environment Agency
Apollo Court, 2 Bishops Sq Business park, Hatfield, Herts, AL10 9EX.



Brightwell Cum Sotwell Neighbourhood Plan

By email: jjrdebney@gmail.com

Copy: planning.policy@southoxon.gov.uk

Attn: Jason Debney



**County Hall
New Road
Oxford
OX1 1ND**

**Director for Planning and
Place (Interim) – Susan
Halliwell**

30 January 2017

Dear Jason Debney

Brightwell Cum Sotwell Neighbourhood Plan Pre-Submission Draft

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on your pre-submission draft, albeit late as your original deadline for comments was 11 January.

The following draft allocations are noted as included in the plan:

1. BCS2 – Land at Bosley’s Orchard – 20 dwellings
2. BCS3 – Land at Little Martins Home Farm Barns – 30 dwellings
3. BCS4 – Land at Thorne’s Nursery – 4 dwellings
4. BCS5 a – Slade End Green – Slade End Farm – housing and business use
5. BCS5 b – Slade End Green – Strange’s Nursery – 6 houses
6. BCS5 c - Slade End Green – South to West of Green Lane – 1 house

Sites 2, 3 and 4 are all located towards the northern edge of the village, within reasonable walking distance of the primary school and stops served by the X2 bus service. Sites 5a, 5b and 5c at Slade End Green are located on the north-eastern edge of the village, 400 to 500m from the primary school but still within comfortable walking distance. These locations can be considered sustainable given their proximity to these facilities.

Given the relatively small quantum of development proposed by the plan, it should be noted that the CIL contributions that will be generated by this volume of development may not enable the delivery of a wide variety of local facilities and infrastructure improvements as appears to be envisaged in this draft.

Attached are some comments from departments of Oxfordshire County Council.

Yours sincerely

Lynette Hughes
Senior Planning Officer

Email: Lynette.Hughes@oxfordshire.gov.uk
General Email: southandvale@oxfordshire.gov.uk



Property

I have reviewed the draft Neighbourhood Plan in light of the County Council's property interests in the Neighbourhood Plan area. I note that the list of community facilities covered by Policy BCS17 includes the village school and pre-school. The County Council owns the school playing field.

As draft policy BCS17 would be a relevant policy in relation to the school field, I have considered whether it is appropriately worded.

Firstly there appears to be a degree of duplication of saved Local Plan policy CF1 in the first part of draft policy BCS17, and therefore it is questionable whether the first part of the policy is necessary.

Second, draft policy BCS17 more generally is very similar to guidance in the NPPF at paragraphs 69-70 and Core Strategy policy CSR3, and therefore again there are elements of duplication which suggest that the policy may not be necessary.

Third, draft policy BCS17 (first bullet point) is more restrictive than saved Local Plan policy CF1. CF1 introduces three scenarios (either / or options) where loss of a facility will be permitted, whereas BCS17 only envisages one scenario – financial viability. That is overly restrictive and inconsistent with the strategic policy in the Local Plan as it does not contemplate facilities being reprovided elsewhere in the locality, nor indeed does it contemplate the demand for facilities disappearing. Additionally whereas CF1 refers to economic viability, BCS17 refers to financial viability. These two words may be argued to be similar in meaning, but the terminology is inconsistent. As a consequence it is recommended that the first bullet point be either removed completely (as it duplicates elements of local and national planning policy) or it be reworded to be consistent with the strategic policy (policy CF1).

Fourth and finally, the last bullet point of BCS17 does not recognise the fact that such facilities may be able to change use without requiring planning permission, via the permitted development route. It might be sensible to reflect that point in the wording of the policy.

Public Health

Although 'protecting healthy communities' is included within Section 3 Planning Policy Context, neither section 5.1 Vision nor section 5.2 Objectives make overt reference to improving the health and wellbeing of residents. Key general points to consider including and linking in with the Planning Policies that follow might include encouraging the development of an environment which:

- provides opportunities for people to be more active (this could be linked with CIL objectives for new and repaired footpaths and a cycleway to Didcot)
- provides opportunities to make healthier food choices (this could be linked to the aspiration for a community orchard)
- fosters good mental health and wellbeing by increasing opportunities for social interaction/reducing social isolation and loneliness (this could be linked to the protection of Local Green Space)
- enables people to maintain their independence for longer (this could be linked with CIL objectives for accessible gates and styles)

The above are supported by NPPF paragraphs 7, 35, 50, 69, 156 and the PPG 'Health and Wellbeing' chapter.

Some of the 'Site Allocation Policies' state that the road layout will only be supported if they are "*designed in a way that follows the traditional 'lane' type found elsewhere in the village without pavements*" whilst section vii in the 'Design Principles' states that development proposals will not be supported if they "*include installing pavements or kerbs to existing village lanes*" (Policy BCs8). To enable people to be more active Paragraph 35 of the NPPF states that developments should be located and designed where practical to give priority to pedestrian movements, create safe and secure layouts which minimise conflicts between traffic and pedestrians and consider the needs of people with disabilities (all modes). If no pavements are to be provided it is strongly recommended that this is accompanied with appropriate measures to limit the volume and speed of traffic (such as extended 20mph zones) so that the mobility of more vulnerable road users such as children, parents with push chairs, disabled people and older people is not impaired.

Transport

Brightwell-cum-Sotwell is currently defined as a 'smaller village' (South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2032 Settlement Assessment: June 2016). However as part of the 'preferred options' consultation it has been asked whether a 'medium-sized' village category should be introduced. Were this to be the case Brightwell could potentially be considered a suitable candidate for inclusion given its half-hourly Monday to Saturday and hourly Sunday bus service to Wallingford, Didcot, Abingdon and Oxford and proximity to services and employment in Wallingford and Didcot (based upon the existing scoring system). This may have a bearing on the quantum of development sought: 'smaller villages' are currently expected to deliver 5 percent growth, while 'larger villages' are expected to deliver 10 percent growth. We note that the quantum of development provided for in this draft Neighbourhood Plan may be over 5 percent and therefore a change of status to 'medium' would be unlikely to attract an additional allocation requirement.

The funding of cycle links from Brightwell-cum-Sotwell to Didcot is suggested as part of the suggested CIL 'wishlist'. OCC has no plans for delivery of a cycle facility along the A4130 at this time: NCN route 5 offers a recommended route from Brightwell to Didcot along quieter roads, though it is appreciated that this is via a circuitous route. If this is something that remains in the Neighbourhood Plan and the Parish Council seek to use their funds in future for, then OCC would be interested in discussions as to how funds might be best used.

It is noted that the A4130 effectively bypasses the village, meaning that there is little cause for traffic to enter the village road network unless needing to visit destinations in the village itself or in the village of Mackney to the south. This in conjunction with the style and arrangement of buildings in the village, plentiful footways and a 20mph zone is helpful in terms of maintaining a safe road network within the village. However frequent references to a 'shared space' approach with regard to accesses to new developments are made within the pre-submission document: this is

understood in the context of the village but further consideration and clarification of what is sought may be helpful.

Transport Comments Provided October 2016

Little Martins and Home Farm Barns – 30 dwellings

Question over whether access is achievable

The access can be made acceptable in highways terms. The site access is on the outside of a bend and therefore visibility is much greater than might be assumed and so is acceptable in highways terms, given a number of provisos.

The provisos are that: ○ the levels are altered such that they are within the recommendations of Inclusive Mobility, ○ footways are provided to link the site to the existing village, although shared surfaces may be acceptable within the site, as is common in Brightwell-cum-Sotwell,

- a retaining wall is used to widen the access, ○ the track is protected at all stages of construction,
- Acceptable drainage is provided such that spoil is not exported to the newly created metalled access.
- The access way will require that the tracked movements of HGVs and cars would overlap but this factor is deemed acceptable for low frequency movements in the Manual for Streets. However, this will cap the site in terms of housing to no more than the 30 proposed additionally:
- This list is not necessarily exhaustive and will potentially be added to at later stages of analysis of the development through the Transport Statement.

Thorne's nursery – 5 dwellings

Access required from Old Nursery Lane: very narrow with pinch point outside 'Woodleys'. Is a maximum of 5 houses OK in highways terms if we there is an assurance that there would be no more development on the site? Would the road require widening/improving for access by refuse vehicles? Is the road adopted?

There are already houses being served by Thorne Lane and therefore this could not be construed as a private drive (over 6 dwellings), by serving 5 additional houses. The road would need upgrading therefore, but this may be possible in sympathetic materials to the context and be hardwearing and of an adoptable standard. There have been applications on this site previously for a modest number of dwellings, which the Highways Authority did not object to. Widening is recommended where possible. With the level of intensification proposed, a number of judicious passing spaces would be consistent with the grain of development elsewhere in Brightwell-cum-Sotwell rather than two-way transit throughout. Within the SODC area the default position is that refuse vehicles do not enter small developments. This would mean that it would be an imperative that the surfacing of the road would be metalled so wheeled bins can be brought to a suitable location. No condition would be required, people would have to bring bins to a location of acceptable wheeling distance (a refuse consultant can give recommendations regarding the extent of this distance). Regarding adoption, enquiries will need to be made with the county Highways Records team (highway.records@oxfordshire.gov.uk). If this road is adopted, then any development

that requires alterations to the road would need to be under agreement. If not then it could be offered for adoption, although we may be unlikely to adopt, in which case maintenance would be a under a management company.

Bosley's orchard – 20 dwellings

In principle there is no objection to this development: could access be from the old spur of the High Road or does it need to come off the highway?

Access is recommended to be as far down the spur as possible, as the spur is an existing feature, to serve a modest number of dwellings it would seem appropriate. Intensification of the use of the spur may mean that it would be appropriate to install some psychological speed reducing feature near the junction with the A4130, such as visual narrowing. The inclusion in the Local Plan (Policy BCS2) means the site is in principle acceptable but this does not mean that in highways terms it is. A lower density of development, of about 10 dwellings only. The last application on the site was back in 2003 (P03/W0329 - Erection of two detached houses and garages. The Old Orchard, High Road, Brightwell-cum-Sotwell): this was refused but not on highways grounds, although it was for 2 houses.

A pre-application submission was made on this site in December 2015. The county's Ecologist Planner stated in their response that SODC ecology's officer should comment on the ecological implications for this site. Page 24 of the 'design report' submitted with the pre-application submission documents indicates that the suggestion of a 30m buffer zone has resulted from discussions between SODC ecology officers and the design team's ecologists. An outline planning application has since been submitted for this site (P16/S3958/O) for 13 dwellings, a reduction of 7 on the 20 that are proposed to be allocated in the neighbourhood plan. It is understood that issues relating to the proposed buffer zone are the reason for the suggested reduced quantum of development, which has raised concerns within the Neighbourhood Plan group over the viability of the plan should a reduction be necessary. It is suggested that discussions take place with the Local Planning Authority and the developer to seek a resolution to this issue.

Slade End Green – up to 15 dwellings

Access to this site is narrow and down an unmade road. There is also a question of whether it is adopted or not.

Sotwell Street is narrow and already serves a number of dwellings so I could not endorse intensification of the use of the road to the extent of 15 dwellings without extensive works to produce a shared surface of 6.0m wide (with some local narrowings acceptable). This would generate a situation consistent with Slade End. Highways Records can inform of the adopted nature or not – it seems doubtful but is possible.

The above advice represents the informal opinion of an Officer of the Council based upon the information submitted. This is given entirely without prejudice to the formal consideration of any planning application which may be submitted.

Appendix B

Pre-Submission Consultation
(Regulation 14 of The Neighbourhood
Planning
(General) Regulations 2012 (as
amended)).

Brightwell cum Sotwell Neighbourhood Plan



The Brightwell cum Sotwell Neighbourhood Plan committee is delighted to invite anyone who lives, works or has a business in the Parish to get involved in the next stage in the process of the creation of the Brightwell cum Sotwell Neighbourhood Plan.

We would like you to look at, and comment on, **The Pre-Submission Report**,

The Draft Sustainability Appraisal Report, incorporating the Strategic and Environmental Report.

These supporting documents are available:

- Site Assessment Report
- Landscape and Green Spaces Study
- The Community Led Parish Plan
- The Brightwell cum Sotwell Conservation Area Character Appraisal
- The Housing Needs Survey

All these documents can be viewed on the Parish Council Website:

<http://www.brightwellcumsotwellpc.org> in the **Documents** section under **Neighbourhood Plan Consultation**.

Hard copies will be available to view during opening hours at Brightwell Village Stores, The Red Lion Pub, Shillingford Bridge Hotel, and from the Parish Office by appointment with the clerk (01491 826968).

We will also be holding two **drop-in sessions** if you wish to talk to a member of the team. These will be held in St Agatha's church room on:

Saturday 10th December from 2pm to 4pm

Wednesday 14th December from 7pm to 9pm

The consulting period will run from 9am Wednesday 23rd November until 9am Wednesday 11th January. If you have any comments to make on this Pre-Submission Report, please do so in the following ways:

To the Parish Council's email address:

bcsparishcouncil@googlemail.com

Appendix C

LOGIN



- HOME
- PARISH COUNCIL
- MEETINGS
- DOCUMENTS
- PLANNING MATTERS
- UPKEEP AND MAINTENANCE
- CONTACTS
- NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN**

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

Pre-Submission Consultation (Regulation 14 of The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended)).

The Brightwell cum Sotwell Neighbourhood Plan committee is delighted to invite anyone who lives, works or has a business in the Parish to get involved in the next stage in the process of the creation of the Brightwell cum Sotwell Neighbourhood Plan.

We would like you to look at, and comment on, The Pre-Submission Report,

The Draft Sustainability Appraisal Report, incorporating the Strategic and Environmental Report.

These supporting documents are available:

Site Assessment Report

Landscape and Green Spaces Study

The Community Led Parish Plan

The Brightwell cum Sotwell Conservation Area Character Appraisal

The Housing Needs Survey

All these documents can be viewed on the Parish Council Website:

<http://www.brightwellcumsotwellpc.org> in the Documents section under Neighbourhood Plan Consultation.

Hard copies will be available to view during opening hours at Brightwell Village Stores, The Red Lion Pub, Shillingford Bridge Hotel, and from the Parish Office by appointment with the clerk (01491 826968).

We will also be holding two drop-in sessions if you wish to talk to a member of the team. These will be held in St Agatha's church room on:

Saturday 10th December from 2pm to 4pm

Wednesday 14th December from 7pm to 9pm

The consulting period will run from 9am Wednesday 23rd November until 9am Wednesday 11th January. If you have any comments to make on this Pre-Submission Report, please do so in the following ways:

To the Parish Council's email address: bcsparishcouncil@googlemail.com

By post to The Parish Clerk at the Parish Office, The Village Hall, West End, Brightwell cum Sotwell OX10 0RY.

Hand deliver to the Parish Council post box on the side of the Village Hall.

Documents relating to the Neighbourhood Plan can be found [here](#).

Find...

