

Chalgrove
Neighbourhood Development Plan
Consultation Statement

Appendix E List of respondents and responses to Draft Plan

Oxfordshire County Council - (full response can be found at appendix F)	
Concerned that the CNDP does not deal with the proposed strategic site at Chalgrove Airfield	No change to plan - The strategic site is at consultation stage only and does not form part of the CNDP
Transport Strategy if airfield goes ahead	No change to plan - The strategic site is at consultation stage only, re-alignment of the the B480 bypass at Chalgrove would not be supported. Diverting traffic through any new development or existing village will have a negative impact on Air Quality. Chalgrove is situated between Watlington and Wallingford both of which have AQM issues
Include Transport improvements in Table 4 of the Plan	Change to plan - Added the following wording as the last paragraph of Justification for Policy H1 - 'Provision of additional bus stops within the development and a contribution to improving the bus service will be provided by the developer as part of the requirements to proceed outlined by Oxford County Council.' No other changes to the Plan - Sufficient walking and cycling routes to be provided within the development to meet up with existing routes. Additional cycle routes within the village are constricted by narrow roads and brooks. This development provides additional access to the countryside with provision of 10 hectares of open meadow previously not accessible
<p>Education</p> <p>Consider the implication of the proposed Strategic Site at Chalgrove Airfield on early year, Nursery and Primary Education Provision</p> <p>The scale of housing growth proposed in this application in isolation should be able to be accommodated by the existing Nursery providers, based on past take up of available places.</p> <p>At this moment, the Primary school does not have sufficient capacity to meet the expected needs of the proposed scale of development. However, birth rates have slowed in recent years, resulting in lower primary school intakes. If this trend continues, the school may be able to accommodate the scale of</p>	<p>No change to the Plan - The proposed strategic site at Chalgrove Airfield does not form part of the CNDP and any infrastructure required including Education will need to be provided with S106 and CIL contributions</p> <p>No change to the Plan - There is a nursery at Monument Business Park, Oxford Nursery is registered for 44 children 0-8 years and the Primary School provides Nursery provision for 30 pre school children.</p> <p>No change to the Plan - extending the school was previously covered by section 106, a CIL claim now needs to be put in to District Council by the County Council.</p>

CNDP Consultation Statement Appendix E List of respondents and responses to Draft Plan

housing growth indicated. Inevitably, there is uncertainty over future birth rates. If the proposed Chalgrove Airfield strategic development is not approved, it would be expected that Icknield Community College would need to expand on its current site and continue to serve Chalgrove.	
Public Health - include key public health points in the Vision and Objectives	No change to Plan, 3.2.1 details the provision for activity across all ages, Appendix 3 of the Character Assessment lists the 36 groups and organisations currently active in the Community.
Watlington Parish Council	
Support objectives within the Plan	No changes required
Question on insurance re flood risk	Change to plan - Added wording to last paragraph of Flooding Statement section of the Plan. 'Consideration should be given to location of homes in proximity to waterways and flood zones to minimise the risk of high insurance premiums for home owners/ occupiers. We would encourage details of flood mitigation measures undertaken to be made available to residents of the new development.'
CIL projects - Need to plan usage and consider maintenance	No change to the Plan - This will form part of process for any project undertaken
Environment Agency	
Consider wording of the flooding statement	Change to plan - The statement has been reworded as suggested by SODC in their response. Supporting statement now forms an appendix to the CNDP
Responsibility for flooding is not just Environment Agency please add others ie OCC and Thames Water	Change to Plan - wording amended to include other responsible bodies

CNDP Consultation Statement Appendix E List of respondents and responses to Draft Plan

Historic England	
Where, having given consideration to the potential affect of development on archaeological remains and the NPPFs advice on taking account of the potential harm to heritage assets, the possibility of avoiding or reducing harm and the balance of public benefits against the loss of benefits provided by heritage, we would expect any site allocation that affects archaeological remains to include a requirement to mitigate harm to archaeological remains.	No change to plan -Archaeological surveys for proposed sites have been undertaken, The National Policy applies.
We found the use of ‘supporting statements’ within the plan particularly vague and potentially unhelpful.	Change to plan - the supporting statements now form an appendix to the plan. National policy applies to flooding, supporting statements were included in the plan as it is such an important issue to Chalgrove's residents.
Christian Leigh, Leigh & Glennie Ltd (full response can be found at appendix F)	
The draft allocation is for a ribbon development that represents a westwards ‘drift’ of housing out from the compact centre of Chalgrove. It is a spread of housing that goes along the main road, with simply no relationship to the village at all	No change to Plan - Chalgrove is linear in nature Development does not extend beyond the junction with the B480. The extension to the site was required to accommodate the increase in allocation in the Local Plan. This was supported by residents in public meetings
The Sustainability Appraisal (2017) that accompanies the draft Neighbourhood Plan has not undertaken a systematic appraisal of the likely significant effects on the landscape arising from the proposed larger Marley Lane allocation compared to the likely effects arising from alternative sites for allocation.	Change to plan - table 6.6 of SA amended
This form of development bears no relationship to the character of Chalgrove or the wider countryside. The proposal has not been informed by any clear response to its setting, and in fact would only make sense if the larger Airfield site is developed, as can be seen in the other plan submitted by the applicants for the current scheme on the land:	No change to Plan - The entrance to the village will be landscaped, the majority of the road access into the village will be open countryside to one side. The plan incorporating the proposed strategic airfield site was requested by SODC and is not part of the developers plans

CNDP Consultation Statement Appendix E List of respondents and responses to Draft Plan

<p>The SODC Landscape Capacity Study (2015) did not assess this site: the assessment was of the smaller 2.1ha site first shown as a 'Community Identified Site' in the draft Chalgrove Neighbourhood Plan, May 2014 (referred to as Site CHAL1 in the 2015 Landscape Study). The Landscape Study found development should be further considered on this land but – most importantly – in fact on a smaller area of the site.</p>	<p>No change to Plan - Sites 10 and 11 came forward as part of the call for sites carried out at the beginning of the process, Site 1 was extended as a response to the increased housing allocation, these have been included in our site assessment</p>
<p>This pattern of development would also create a pattern of unsustainable dependence on the private car.</p>	<p>Change to Plan - Added the following wording as the last paragraph of Justification for Policy H1 - 'Provision of additional bus stops within the development and a contribution to improving the bus service will be provided by the developer as part of the requirements to proceed outlined by Oxford County Council.'</p> <p>No other change to the Plan - Footpaths from the development will be integrated into existing paths.</p> <p>The development is in close proximity to the Doctor's surgery, the Lamb Public House, the new community building, the cricket club and the allotments. Not all services are in the centre of the village</p>
<p>Western side development will lead to a spread of housing that simply becomes a dormitory to Oxford</p>	<p>No change to Plan - Oxford City Centre is 12 miles from Chalgrove the location of this site would not increase commuting to Oxford</p>
<p>Increased risk to flooding from preferred site</p>	<p>No change to Plan - All development will be located in flood zone one, mitigation measures are included in the development plan, and the site is down stream from the village so any run off will have less impact</p>
<p>Cuxham Parish Meeting</p>	
<p>Request that the negative impact on traffic is considered</p>	<p>No change to Plan - The CNDP acknowledge this and will continue to consider it where able</p>
<p>Resident 1 - Chalgrove</p>	
<p>Will affordable housing be available?</p>	<p>No change to Plan - The CNDP contains policy requiring 40% affordable homes where viable this will be provided through a housing association</p>
<p>Will smaller homes be available</p>	<p>No change to Plan - The NDP contains a policy for housing mix which includes smaller homes as reflected in the Chalgrove Housing Questionnaire</p>
<p>Will homes be available for local people</p>	<p>No change to Plan - The allocation of affordable homes is based on need, the developer has been asked to offer market housing to local people for the first three months</p>

CNDP Consultation Statement Appendix E List of respondents and responses to Draft Plan

Resident 2 - Chalgrove	
<p>Whilst regretting that the community has been targetted with disproportionate development, please note my support for the preferred site over Chal 7 which is upstream from the village and therefore poses a greater flood risk. I also believe that it will be far easier to integrate housing at the west end of the village</p>	<p>No change to Plan</p>
Resident 3 - Chalgrove	
<p>Several points raised for clarity</p> <p>H1 option B - as planning permission has been refused can this be removed</p> <p>Economy - Does the NDP need to allocate land for Employment</p> <p>Scoping report out of date</p>	<p>Change to plan - Text amended to provide clarity to the points raised</p> <p>Change to plan - Policy H1 amended to remove option B</p> <p>No change to Plan - if land is not allocated it will be allocated by SODC. The Business Development Supporting Statement covers this</p> <p>This was produced in 2015 and has been superceded by the Environment report</p>
Resident Stadhampton	
<p>I wish to object to the draft plan because of its new larger Marley Lane site for housing spreading Chalgrove Village westwards in a ribbon development towards Ascott and Stadhampton and away from Chalgrove village centre increasing reliance on cars because of poor public transport and changing out of all proportion the gateway into the village from the open countryside.</p>	<p>No change to Plan - Chalgrove is linear in nature Development does not extend beyond the junction with the B480. The extension to the site was required to accommodate the increase in allocation in the Local Plan. This was supported by residents in public meetings The entrance to the village will be landscaped, the majority of the road access into the village will be open countryside to one side. Provision of additional bus stops within the development and a contribution to improving the bus service will be provided by the developer as part of the requirements to proceed outlined by Oxford County Council.' Oxford City Centre is 12 miles from Chalgrove the location of this site would not increase commuting to Oxford</p>

CNDP Consultation Statement Appendix E List of respondents and responses to Draft Plan

HCA	
No comment on the draft plan	
Wessex Homes	
Objection raised in relation to a proposed development at Chalgrove Farm (Chal 4)	No change to Plan The proposal was not put forward during the the plan process prior to pre submission draft consultation, the vision presented to the NDP steering group was assessed using the same criteria as all other sites.
Little Milton Parish Council	
Note that the proposed Chalgrove Airfield strategic site is not included and ask to consider if further explanation is required	The decision not to include the proposed strategic site was considered carefully and excluded for the following reasons <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Chalgrove Parish Council and many residents do not support this proposal on sustainability and highway grounds. • The strategic site is a proposal which is currently in consultation stage only
SODC (full response can be found at appendix F)	
We have agreed to incorporate all suggestions made by SODC in some cases with minor amendments to wording, the full response can be found at appendix F	Change to plan - All suggestions by SODC incorporated, the full response can be found at appendix F
Natural England	
No Comment	
Oxfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group	
No comment relevant to the Plan	
CPRE	
No comment	

Gladman (full response can be found at appendix F)	
The Plan period should reflect the emerging local plan timetable of 2017 to 2033	Change to plan - Text amended
Policy C1 - Object to the use of defining a built up edge, and suggest amendment to wording	Change to plan - The policy text amended in line with suggestions from SODC
Policy C2 - This policy states that ‘the form and scale of buildings should reflect the neighbouring properties. Buildings should be a maximum of 2-storeys in height (based on a residential storey of 3 metres)’. Gladman are supportive of policies that seek to ensure that new development responds positively to setting and in particular the scale and form of surrounding built form. However, the current wording of this policy has the potential to have the unintended consequence of stifling the variety of form and legibility within new developments. Further, this policy also requires all development proposals to be in accordance with the South Oxfordshire Design Guide. Gladman is concerned that this would require all development proposals to incorporate principles of design guidance which are non-statutory in nature. In addition, this policy sets out a requirement to protect and enhance views into and out of the village and have sensitivity to preserving the views to and from the AONB. Whilst the general thrust of this policy is supported, it is not clear what evidence, if any, has been prepared to support the key views shown in Map 2 ‘Chalgrove Village Views’	No change to plan - This policy takes its reference from the local area as set out in the character assessment, it is not prescriptive but simply seeks to ensure that new development is in keeping with the character of Chalgrove.
Housing - Land at Chalgrove Airfield. The emerging SOLP currently proposes to allocate 'Land at Chalgrove Airfield'. The CNDP currently rejects this emerging allocation and is therefore inconsistent with the emerging SOLP	Change to plan - The strategic site is at consultation stage only and does not form part of the CNDP. Text amended to remove the objection and replace with a paragraph stating that the Parish Council and many residents object to the proposal on sustainability and Highway grounds.
Site Submission -Gladman consider that the land off Monument Road known as Chal 8 should be included in the CNDP	No change to plan - The site was rejected in the CNDP on the grounds of sustainability, the site is on the opposite side of the B480 to the village and does not have cohesion with the existing community it is also under the flight path for Chalgrove Airfield. Development on this site has been objected to by Martin Baker Ltd in September 2017 on grounds that the location of the dwellings for which planning permission is sought would compromise safe operations from

	<p>Runway 31/13 at Chalgrove airfield. The letter from their legal representatives Gowling WLG can be found on the SODC website in relation to Planning notice (P17/S3053/O) and refers to a visit to the site by a Senior CAA airfield Inspector who confirms that dwellings built on the land in question would penetrate the relevant surfaces and would not be considered to be shielded by an existing immovable object.</p>
<p>Given the uncertainty of Oxford City's housing needs and the 1,200 dwellings that is still to be agreed, the CNDP should seek to be aspirational and growth orientated so that it can assist the Council in meeting full objectively assessed needs for housing.</p>	<p>NO change to plan - SODC's ability to deliver its full OAN is dependent on its strategy for the District not the CNDP</p>
<p>Boyer for Wates Development (full response can be found at appendix F)</p>	
<p>CNDP Site Criteria - May 2016 point 3.6 - Concern that sites 1,10 and 11 are assessed as three individual sites. However, from relatively on in the CNP preparation these three sites were combined to form a single site at the wesern end of the village. Despite this the document provides no assessment of the three combined sites and the cumulative impact of these sites against the criteria. This is a flaw and an omission in the document.</p> <p>Point 3.8 The draft allocated site is not included, assessed or referenced at all within the Site Criteria document. However it forms the only draft allocation within the CNP. The guidance wihtin the NPPG states that sites should be assessed against clearly identified criteria but this has not been the case. Rather the CNP allocates a site which has not be assessed against the criteria during the site selection process and which was only introduced late in the process, thereby bypassing the original shortlisting of sites and public votes.</p>	<p>The site criteria document was published in May 2016 following site visits and subsequent analysis carried out over the previous 24 months by the site focus group and the steering group and now forms an appendix to the Environment Report. At that time sites 1, 10 and 11 were still being proposed as three separate sites with allocations on each site totalling the then proposed requirement of 82 homes. Following the revised allocation to 200 homes in SODC's preferred option 1 (June 2016), developers of sites 1,10 and 11 and 7 amended their plans to accommodate more homes. Sites 1, 10 and 11 were combined and extended to accommodate 200 homes and the plan for site 7 was amended to accommodate 120 homes. Both amended plans and sites were reviewed by the steering group against the same site criteria used throughout the process.</p> <p>Following each assessment, refinements were made to the Plan. Whenever significant changes were made, for example a change to flood map or number of homes allocate the group re-tested these against the sustainability framework. A flood remodelling report was commissioned by the CNDP in June 2016 as not all of the area for sites 1,10 and 11 and site 7 had been included in the flood modelling that informed the revised Environment Agency Map published in October 2015. This remodelling was necessary to ensure that all sites being considered were done so using the same criteria, the amended area for site 1, 10 and 11 was included in the remodelling once known.</p>

<p>Point 3.7 Furthermore sites 1,10 and 11 (which could accommodate approximately 80 dwellings) were subject to consultation, assessments and public vote until mid-2016 when the site significantly changed to form a larger site measuring 19.7ha and which extends away from the village by 1km. This now forms the draft allocated site within CNP.</p> <p>Point 3.9. This document forming part of the evidence base does not comply with guidance within the NPPG</p>	<p>No change to plan - Consultation on the proposed sites and plans has been undertaken throughout the plan preparation and feedback taken into account. The revised plans to accommodate more homes for both sites 1, 10 and 11 and site 7 were consulted on at a public meeting in October 2016 where both developers were present, this included the larger 19.7 ha site proposed at sites 1,10 and 11. The boards presented at that meeting were published on the NDP web site.</p> <p>The revised plan for sites 1, 10 and 11 was consulted on at a public meeting in March 2017 when the draft policies were presented. These plans were also made available at a public meeting in May when the pre submission document was presented. The pre submission draft plan was consulted on for the 6 week period from April 26th to June 5th 2017, this included the revised plan and site for the land West of Marley Lane (sites 1,10 & 11)</p> <p>Change to plan - the Site Criteria document forms an appendix to the CNDP environment report.</p>
<p>-CNDP Sustainability Appraisal Environmental Report</p> <p>Point 3.11. - Map 2.1 in the SA is stated on page 10 to be taken from the SODC SHLAA 2013 and added to with the additional potential sites for inclusion in the NP. Map 2.1 includes the 19.7ha site, even though this does not feature within the Site Criteria assessment document. Furthermore, the SHLAA includes 'CHAL1' which is the smaller, original site. The larger 19.7ha site is not included in the SHLAA and at no stage has it been assessed by SODC. This map in the SA is therefore incorrect in stating that the base data is from the SHLAA.</p> <p>Section 5 of the report sets out the consultation responses from the Environment Agency, Natural England and Historic England. The SA does not state which date they were consulted. However, the Scoping Report sets out a timeframe which suggests that such consultation responses were sought in</p>	<p>Change to Plan - the reference to the map being taken from the SHLAA has been removed.</p> <p>The SHLAA contained possible development sites for Chalgrove, this was used as a base and were subsequently added to following a call for sites by CNDP to all landowners in the Parish. Map 2.1 has been replaced with Map 2 which shows the sites identified by landowners or their agents which they considered as having potential for development, all sites are within the designated area for Chalgrove Parish</p> <p>No change to plan - The environment Agency, Natural England and Historic England were consulted on the pre submission draft plan which included the extended site 1, 10 and 11. Their responses are included in this document.</p>

<p>Autumn 2015, which means it likely refers to the original site size, not the 19.7ha site now forming the draft allocation. No evidence is provided to demonstrate that the Environment Agency, Natural England and Historic England have been consulted on the draft allocation site.</p> <p>3.13 It is noted on page 31 of the Sustainability Appraisal that the CNP group visited each of the 11 potential sites in 2014 and presented findings and assessments to the public in November 2014 and residents were asked to rank the sites by preference. This led to the shortlist of sites 1, 10 and 11 (combined) and site 7. Of course, the combined sites 1, 10 and 11 that were assessed at that time, and which the public voted on, bear very little resemblance to the draft allocation which measures 19.7ha. This is evidenced in Figure 1 of these representations. As such, the draft allocated site has not been subject to the same level of scrutiny as the other sites which have been considered and the draft allocation is not based on any robust evidence or assessment.</p> <p>3.14 During 2016, flood remodelling was undertaken which demonstrated that part of sites 10 and 11 were located within flood zone 3. The SA then notes that as a result of this, sites 1, 10 and 11 were merged and a developable area identified within flood zone 1. It is assumed that it was at this point that additional land was incorporated within site 1, 10 and 11 in order to provide 200 dwellings within flood zone 1. This means that every consultation and assessment undertaken up to this stage on site 1, 10 and 11 are irrelevant and that the new larger combined site 1, 10 and 11 was taken forward with no previous assessment or consideration.</p> <p>3.15 Section 6 of the SA explores reasonable alternatives. However, there has been no assessment undertaken on the option of the original site known as 1, 10 and 11 (i.e. which could accommodate approximately 80 dwellings) and site 7 which can accommodate 120 dwellings. This is a logical alternative to consider as these two sites were the shortlisted sites and would provide the</p>	<p>No change to plan - see response to point 3.6 above.</p> <p>Change to plan - wording amended to clarify that the developer of 1, 10 and 11 commissioned a flood report on their sites using the same methodology as that commissioned by CNDP. This led to the developers of those sites producing an amended plan to merge the sites with all developable area in flood zone 1. This was presented at a public meeting in October 2016. The report received by CNDP was used by the steering group as part of the site assessment for the revised plan.</p> <p>Change to plan - Table 6.9 of the plan has been amended to include Site 1,10 & 11 and site 7 as reasonable alternative option H1 C</p>
---	---

<p>200 dwellings which are required through the Neighbourhood Chalgrove Neighbourhood Plan Representations o.b.o Wates Developments 9 Plan. The lack of consideration of this option is an omission and a flaw, especially given that the Pre-submission Neighbourhood Plan set out a scenario whereby both sites could accommodate development.</p> <p>3.16 This scenario is set out in policy H1 – Housing Site Allocations which states “Should the planning application for Site H1 option B for up to 120 homes be granted approval prior to the NDP being made we would support development of 80-100 homes at Site H1 option A to provide the total proposed level of acceptable growth of 200 homes”. It is thus a significant flaw that such an option has not been considered.</p> <p>3.17 Tables 6.3 and 6.5 of the SA set out assessments on all potential sites (table 6.3) and a comparison between the two sites of 1, 10 and 11 and site 7 (table 6.5). Table 6.3 attributes separate scores to sites 1, 10 and 11 whereas table 6.5 considers them as a single site. This is not a consistent approach and undermines the assessments undertaken in the document.</p> <p>3.18 In the assessments undertaken in table 6.3, it is not clear whether it is the original site 1, 10 and 11 referred to, or the larger 19.7ha site. Some of the answers between the tables differ for site 1, 10 and 11, which suggests that the two different sized sites have been considered. For example, a criteria within table 6.3 is to ‘ensure that any new development does not place people and property at risk of flooding or exacerbate flood issues’. The score for each site of 1, 10 and 11 was a double positive score. However, for the same criteria in table 6.5, the score for 1, 10 and 11 is negative. This suggests that between these two assessments the different sized sites were considered.</p>	<p>Change to plan - SODC advised that this was not appropriate and therefore the wording has been amended to remove this option from policy H1</p> <p>Change to plan - Table 6.3 amended. The original assessment was originally undertaken in March 2016, prior to the increased allocation in the SODC preferred options 1 and the extended area combining sites 1, 10 and 11 coming forward. A further assessment has been carried out by the Steering Group taking these into account</p> <p>Individual site assessments against sustainability objectives were originally undertaken in March 2016, prior to the increased allocation in the SODC preferred options 1 from 82 to 200 dwellings. Following this increase in allocation a combination of sites 1, 10 and 11 came forward from one developer.</p> <p>A further assessment was carried out by the Steering Group in August 2017 considering this as one combined site. Table 6.6 has been updated taking into account, all information gained, analysis undertaken and feedback from the pre-submission documents. Table 6.7 identifies relevant changes since the assessment carried out in March 2016</p>
--	--

<p>3.19 There is also inconsistency between the two tables in the way that Site 7/H1B is scored. Regarding the same flooding category ‘Ensure that any new development does not place people and property at risk of flooding or exacerbate existing flooding issues’, Table 6.4 provides a score of ‘positive’ to site 7 whereas table 6.5 provides a score of ‘double negative’. Once more this demonstrates the lack of consistency and lack of robustness in the assessments made. Scoping Report – July 2015 3.20 The Scoping Report is dated July 2015</p>	<p>Change to plan - see above CNDP commissioned an independent analysis of the FRA provided by the developers of the Land East of Chalgrove. This was conducted by Water Resources Associates, Consultants in Hydrology, specialising in rainfall run off modelling, in August 2017. This report raises a number of issues and inconsistencies in the FRA provided by the developer. The major inconsistencies found within the FRA are listed below, the full report is available as an Appendix to this report :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This review of the Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Assessment reports submitted by JNP Group have a number of deficiencies and inaccuracies, such as incorrectly defining the catchment area contributing flows to the site. • The groundwater monitoring in August 2016 does not show a seasonal worst case, there is no evidence to support the claim by JNP that August 2016 was characterised by prolonged extreme rainfall and monitoring of groundwater levels should be continued through the winter months. • IH Report 124 is outdated and not the current recommended method for estimating Greenfield flows. Estimates for the Greenfield and developed site flow should be made using the ReFH software from the Flood Estimation Handbook. The areas allocated on the Figure of Appendix A of the Drainage Assessment report do not seem to be sufficiently large given their shallow maximum depth of 0.75m.
<p>Scoping Report</p> <p>The Scoping Report is dated July 2015 and as such sets out the consultation undertaken, but only until mid 2015. As such there is no clear timeline provided in any of the evidence base documents for the consultation taken after this date. 3.21 All references to potential sites within this document show the original site 1, 10 and 11, without the enlargement to form the</p>	<p>No change to plan - the scoping report has been superseded by the CNDP Environmental report. The consultation statement which is submitted with the Plan provides detail of the consultation that has taken place throughout the CNDP process.</p>

<p>19.7ha site. This means that the Scoping Report makes absolutely no reference to the draft allocated site and as such cannot be considered as robust evidence to support the CNP.</p>	
<p>Policies</p> <p>Policy C1 – Development Within the Built-up Area 4.2 This policy defines the built up area as “the boundaries of permanent, non-agricultural buildings located around the edge of the village, where such properties are directly connected to the village’s main, singular form”.</p> <p>4.3 There is no map provided to visually portray the built-up-area and we consider the definition provide is not sufficiently clear and could be open to imprecise interpretation by the decision maker.</p> <p>Policy C2 – Design and Character 4.5 This policy sets out design criteria which new developments must abide by. We consider this is overly prescriptive.</p> <p>4.6 The NPPF discusses ‘good design’ in section 7. In particular paragraph 60 states: “Planning policies and decisions should not attempt to impose architectural styles or particular tastes and they should not stifle innovation, originality or initiative through unsubstantiated requirements to conform to certain development forms or styles”</p> <p>4.7 The criteria within Policy C2 attempts to restrict building heights, provides only limited building materials that would be appropriate and defines building lines and boundary treatments. Such requirements fail to allow for originality or initiative through design</p> <p>4.8 To rectify this non-compliance, we suggest that the requirements within the policy are removed, or they are downgraded to design guidelines rather than requirements in order to allow for design initiative in accordance with national policy. Chalgrove Neighbourhood Plan Representations o.b.o Wates Developments</p>	<p>No change to plan - A map is not provided as the policy does not define a boundary on a plan but is descriptive. It also does not restrict development on the edge of the built up area if this is in keeping with the village character. The policy makes it clear that infill development within the built-up area should not normally be an issue provided it conforms to other policies in the Plan.</p> <p>No change to plan - This policy takes its reference from the local area as set out in the character assessment, it is not prescriptive but simply seeks to ensure that new development is in keeping with the character of Chalgrove.</p>

<p>Policy H1 – Housing Site Allocations Housing Requirement</p> <p>4.11 SODC’s latest evidence on housing need is set out within the Oxfordshire SHMA (2014). The SHMA sets out an OAN for the district, which is a range between 725-825dpa. As the SHMA provides no breakdown in figures within the District, the CNP has therefore adopted the emerging Local Plan figure of 200 dwellings for Chalgrove (as set out in table 5g of the Second Preferred Options Local Plan). It should be noted that the emerging Local Plan suggests that larger villages increase by 15%, which actually provides a figure of 236 dwellings for Chalgrove. The emerging Plan states that only the 200 dwellings are required due to the proposed strategic allocation at Chalgrove Airfield. However, due to the current stage of the Local Plan, and the requirement for it to be examined, the draft allocation cannot be assumed to be final. If the Airfield was removed as a strategic allocation, the number of dwellings required to be accommodated within Chalgrove would therefore increase to 236 dwellings. This would mean that the CNP did not accommodate all.</p> <p>4.14 Whist this is not a substantial point, two paragraphs within the supportive text to policy H1 are duplicated (starting with “To demonstrate how this site will be developed in accordance with the NP policies on design...”. One of the paragraphs should be deleted.</p> <p>4.15 The final paragraph of supportive text states that the proposal to allocate Site H1 Option A (formerly known as sites 1, 10 and 11) was identified through a public meeting in October 2016. It is imperative to note that this public event was the first time the enlarged site had been introduced to the public and it had not progressed through the site selection process with assessments against criteria and early public consultation.</p> <p>4.16 Site specific criteria for the draft allocated site are also provided as a sub-category to Policy H1 and are set out on page 27 of the CNP. These criteria simply relate to the proposed Masterplan as submitted with the planning application at Land West of Marley Lane. We have a number of concerns regarding the draft allocated site. requirement for ‘proportionate and robust evidence’.</p>	<p>No change to plan - The emerging Local Plan Preferred Options 2 consultation document, April 2017, indicated an expected level of growth for the village of 15% on current stock plus 82 identified in the local plan resulting in 236 homes over the plan period. However Chalgrove is also identified as a community where a proposed strategic allocation has been made (Chalgrove Airfield) and subsequently while the plan provides a number for the neighbourhood plan it does not require the village to deliver any additional development beyond the strategic allocation should it go ahead. However, the Local Plan supports these communities allocating further development sites.</p> <p>The figure of 200 dwellings - together with existing permissions - represents an increase in the number of houses in the village of approx 17%; this level of development is considered appropriate for the village because it represents a reasonable rate of growth and can be accommodated in a way that integrates the proposed site into the built-up area.</p> <p>Change to plan - duplicate paragraph removed</p> <p>No change to plan see point 3.7</p> <p>No change to plan - site has been assessed against comprehensive criteria and sustainability objectives</p>
--	--

<p>Policy H3 – Home Working 4.18 This policy is not specific to Chalgrove and duplicates existing Core Strategy policy CSEM1 (Supporting a successful economy). It should therefore be deleted.</p> <p>Flooding – Supporting Statement 4.19 The CNP does not include a policy on flooding, as ultimately it is the responsibility of the Environment Agency. Therefore, the supporting statement simply states that “development will only be permitted where it can be demonstrated that the site is not subject to flooding or likely to add to flooding problems in the village”. This appears at odds with the draft allocated site, of which 59% of the entire site is within flood zones 2 and 3. It cannot be demonstrated therefore that the site does not flood.</p> <p>Supporting Statement – Business Development 4.20 This supporting statement sets out that business uses at an appropriate scale will be encouraged.</p> <p>4.21 Emerging Policy EMP1 of the SODC Second Preferred Options Local Plan includes a requirement for Chalgrove (through its NP), to identify an employment area of 2.25ha. The CNP has not done this.</p> <p>4.24 Supporting statements, rather than policies, are provided in relation to flooding, biodiversity, heritage assets, archaeological sites and business development.</p> <p>Section 5 - Land East of Chalgrove (for full response see appendix F)</p>	<p>No change to plan - Due to Chalgrove's rural location and lack of public transport this is of particular importance to the Parish</p> <p>Change to plan - supporting statements now form an appendix to the Plan document. No other changes all development on the site is within flood zone 1 with flood alleviation measures in place.</p> <p>Change to plan - supporting statements now form an appendix to the Plan document</p> <p>No change to plan - the CNDP has not allocated employment sites and will allow SODC to identify employment sites on the community's behalf. The growth is stated to be likely within the Monument Business Park which has a plan for growth.</p> <p>Change to plan - supporting statements now form an appendix to the Plan document</p> <p>Change to plan - table 6.9 replaces table 6.5 and has been amended</p>
---	---