

Drayton Neighbourhood Plan

Summary of representations submitted by Vale of White Horse District Council to the independent examiner pursuant to paragraph 9 of Schedule 4B to the 1990 Act

Consultee	Summary of Comment
Ms Teresa Taylor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Against development planned for Drayton
Mr Daniel Scharf	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Neighbourhood Plans (NP) need to be more ambitious than Local Plans if they are to contribute to the achievement of the necessary carbon emissions reductions. • Few policies are precise enough to be included in a development plan. Objectives of sustainable development are insufficiently clear. It does not go far enough regarding energy efficiency. • NP should remove permitted development rights to prevent homes from being extended. • All developments should finance car clubs for new and existing residents. • The importance of local food was identified in the Sustainability Appraisal but the NP doesn't contain any policies on it. • NP should include a phasing policy. • Policy P-H2 – references to VWHDC Local Plan are out of date. Opening text should be in supporting text. • Policy on Local Building Materials should be deleted as it is probably contrary to European Law. The objective might be achieved through a different policy relating to emissions. • Travel Plan policy is critical to ensuring sustainable development. It should be rewritten so that permission for new residential or commercial development will not be granted where a Travel Plan has not identified ways in which it could be carried out without there being any net increase in car traffic. • Policy P-LF2 should be proscriptive rather than permissive. • Policies on Self-build and cohousing need reinstating in the plan. • Drayton Design Guide is superfluous and confusing. • Will there be a list of non-designated heritage assets? • Affordable Housing policy should include demand to meet Local Needs Housing, self-building and cohousing. There should also be a requirement to submit a housing needs assessment to show how “affordable” housing would be genuinely affordable without government subsidy. • South of High Street should include a modest smallholding

	<p>or 'village farm'. It should also contribute towards playing fields on the land to the rear/west of Lockway.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manor Farm site cannot preserve or enhance the character or appearance if developed for 50 houses rather than the original planning permission for 16. Housing should contribute towards planning field provision and improvements to the village hall. • North of Barrow Road site is no closer to the centre of the village than Sherwood's Farm or Long Meadow. Site would constitute ribbon development. It is an exposed position on entering the village and would impact on frequent use of the bridleway. Development would require removal of existing agricultural development, which would need to be relocated in the open countryside.
Vale of White Horse District Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the Neighbourhood Plan. Satisfied that it meets the basic conditions.
Mr Anthony Croucher	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not consider that I have been consulted. Virtually nothing I and others have suggested has been taken on board. • Main concern relates to the way the Steering Group have facilitated landowner/developer plans for the Barrow Road site whilst at the same time limiting participation of residents affected.
Thames Water	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the inclusion of the section on water supply and sewerage infrastructure and would like to see it remain in the adopted version.
WYG Planning & Environment on behalf of Miller Homes & Paul Cauldwell	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the allocation of the North of Barrow Road site. • Policy P-H2 states that the site is capable of taking approximately 60 homes. This would be at a density of 17.6 dwellings per hectare and would be lower density than the surrounding area. A development of approximately 70 dwellings would deliver 20.6 dwellings per hectare. This is considered to represent a more efficient and sustainable use of space in accordance with the NPPF. In addition, the developer has undertaken pre application discussions with Planning Officers at the Vale of White Horse District Council, who have requested a higher portion of smaller 2 and 3 bedroom properties in order to meet need set out in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment. To meet this requirement the draft proposals have seen a number of larger plots subdivided.
JPPC for Delafield Brothers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcome the proactive approach to the delivery of housing along with the desire to deliver a range of housing. • The plan includes smaller units to allow 'downsizing' but there is no specific provision for specialise sheltered or other care type housing. • Development of client's site would deliver key benefits to

	<p>the village, including specialist accommodation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aware of concerns relating to noise from the A34 but this would be less of an issue for specialist sheltered housing as occupants tend to spend a greater proportion of their time indoors. The building and wider site could also be screened from sound from the A34. • The site also performs well against the other 7 site assessment criteria.
D2 Planning on behalf of Blue Cedar Homes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land South of 10 Halls Close is available for development. Blue Cedar Homes would like to work with the community in bringing forward retirement led development. • Object to the submission of the NP in advance of the adopted Vale of White Horse Local Plan as it is premature to a variety of issues being resolved. • The NP should not proceed until there is a clear overall housing provision for Drayton. There is no evidence for the 10% growth figure suggested in the plan. The proposed figure is too low and should be increased to at least 350 dwellings. • The site selection process is not robust. • Land South of 10 Halls Close performs better than North of Barrow Road in the site assessments and should therefore be allocated in its stead. • The plan should be reviewed in full every 2 years instead of every five.
Savills on behalf of Bloor Homes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The NP meets the basic conditions • It has been prepared in a 'sound' manner, namely it is prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy. • Concern about the legibility of Figures 8, 9 and 10. The plans currently do not show how the site is to be accessed and they are not to scale. The Figures should be amended to include clear plans and site boundaries including means of access. • The NP does not include a quantum of development against each allocated site. To provide clarity and certainty Policy P-H2 should include maximum numbers against each development site.
Mr C Narrainen	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support
Mandy Porter and Tony Everitt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Endorse the plan. • The Parish Council has worked exhaustively with the local community to come up with what they have. • Support the resulting planning suggestion of the three sites identified for additional housing in Drayton.
DPDS on behalf of the Earl of Plymouth Estate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Figure 9 does not show the current site boundary being worked towards with the Parish and District Council. The aspect of the plan is angled, which reduces accurateness and legibility of the plan. • Figure 3 does not represent the current vision for the site

	<p>that has been arrived at through consultation, particularly regarding the position of the access.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The plan states that a staggered junction arrangement is envisaged but Figure 3 shows a cross road. • Figure 3 also shows the farm buildings to the south of the site as retained but this is not the current intention.
Mr Mark Oliver	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to the proposed development on the Manor Farm site as over development within the Conservation Area. • The previous planning permission for 16 dwellings was carefully considered so that development would preserve and enhance the Conservation Area whilst still retaining the open character of the village. • Little reference to the Conservation Area in the Drayton 2020 report. • The local character is generally detached dwellings with good sized gardens. Proposal for 50 homes will be out of character. • Increase number of houses on other two sites rather than proposing housing on this site.
Mr Michael Steptoe	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the plan on the whole. • Upon seeing the plans at the Village Hall on 27 & 28 June I was feeling very let down as it was clear that the Steering Group hadn't listened to any of the residents' concerns regarding North of Barrow Road. • After this, a second set of plans was being shown around to certain residents, which were different to those shown at the exhibition.
Dr Derek Pooley	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcome Localism and congratulate Drayton Parish Council and Drayton 2020 on their excellent work. • Inevitably the plan contains many compromises, almost no-one will find it exactly as they would like, but it will be acceptable to a majority. The housing sites are a particularly sensitive compromise. • It is crucial that new changes are not inserted arbitrarily at this late stage, particularly not in the new housing aspects of the NP.
Mrs Jennifer Pooley	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reluctantly accept more houses must be built but in favour of the 3 sites chosen as they are evenly spread around the village. • Welcome insistence that developers should provide benefits to the village. • No further submissions from potential developers should be given consideration before 2031, otherwise it will set a precedent. • Greatest concern is the build-up of Drayton's traffic, making village life unpleasant and even dangerous. Has much consideration been given to the provision of school places?
Mr Michael Neil	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drayton Parish Council have done a magnificent job.

	Request that the Council Planning Officials give their full support to the 2020 Plan and do not consider making significant arbitrary changes that could threaten the whole plan.
Mr Julian Fowler	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support. The plan put forward provides a coherent and holistic vision of how the village can meet the needs for housing growth whilst responding to the interested of the villagers. The plan defines what the village do and what they don't want.
Highways Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comments
The Coal Authority	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No specific comments
Scottish and Southern Energy Power Distribution	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is anticipated that there may be sufficient capacity to supply the 11 Drayton sites from the Winsmore Lane primary substation and the existing hv distribution network, but may be subject to off-site reinforcement works to the existing hv distribution network. • Information about location of overhead and underground lines.
The Office for Nuclear Regulation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comments
Natural England	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support policies C-S3, C-S4, C-S5, C-W9, P-LF1 • The plan could be strengthened further by cross-referencing policies to ensure Parish's green infrastructure is designed to deliver multiple functions. • Policy C-T6 Cycle Way – The Council should seek to link the footpath/bridleways into the Parish's green infrastructure network providing access to and across developments, amenity and leisure facilities and assisting in promoting sustainable transport. Policy could be linked to P-T1. • Policy C-LF9 is welcomed and could also be linked to Policy P-LF6. • Site selection criteria 4 and 8 are welcomed. • Policy P-S2 is welcomed and could be linked to P-LF6, P-WP2 and possibly P-T1. Reference to 'protection and enhancement' is welcomed but might want to also include 'increase'. • Policy P-T1 could be linked to Policy P-WP2. Work and Play objectives could include enhancements to footpaths and cycle tracks linked to green infrastructure.
Marine Management Organisation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comments
Mr Mark Tamburro	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The transport mitigation measures outlined in the plan do will not fix the real problem; calming measures will not resolve the issue. If development is allowed to go ahead then Drayton and the route in and out of Abingdon and to and from A34 will be gridlocked. • Plan should be honest about the extent of the problem.

