Uffington and Baulking Neighbourhood Plan

CONSULTATION STATEMENT: APPENDIX 1

Public Consultation Events and Residents' emails

January 2016 – April 2018

Note: References in the **Subject area** and **Comments** columns reflect the concepts and draft policies of the Plan at the time of the consultation event. References in the **Responses** column refer to the final NP report.

1, Public consultation events

Launch 21 Jan 2016 (post-it notes)

Subject area	Comments	Response
General	Do not want the village to become industrialised/urbanised Environment - every house means two cars How will landowners be consulted Add objective 7: 'To take every opportunity to enhance the built environment of our villages for the benefit of our communities and to continue to attract visitors'	Noted Agreed - see Section 7 See Policy H1 Landowners invited to Public Consultations and access to the website Agreed - see Objective 3
Vision	Our vision needs to acknowledge that there will be more building than that required 'to address the needs of our communities'	Agreed. Has been included in the revised Vision
	How does anyone ensure land in the areas, agreed to be appropriate for	If the landowner is agreeable, the land will become

	development, becomes available	available.
	Consideration of supported living Of utmost importance is the emphasis on affordable housing for those that 'fall' between social housing and 'premium' priced housing	Reference Policy H1 Reference Policy H1
	How/where will you improve employment. What land is available for this employment how?	Reference Section 6
Objectives	Improved public transport? Rail? Infrastructure to support new developments. Roads sewers drainage schools transport Increased traffic means there are problems eg single track and under bridges Sewage system has to be approved & adopted prior to any development being allowed	Both these areas are outside the plan's remit See Section 7 Agree constraint but OCC responsibility This is a district council issue but would be criterion for planning permission

Public consultation event 14 July 2016

Subject area	Comments	Response
Site and other criteria	Publish criteria on website for wider comment, reference suitability, availability, achievability, simplify weightings; clarify if industrial weightings are considered separately	Agree in principle. Amend 'location' to 'location suitability and achievability'. Sites will require landowner agreement so all 'available'. Weightings to be simplified.
	The 'sector' is most important factor	Agree. Increase weighting from 16 to 20%
	Suggest reversing 'no of dwellings' scores to make more houses score more favourably	No action. Single comment on this topic.CLP strongly indicated preference for infill versus larger developments.
Affordable housing	Would like to see weight given to developments with more affordable housing to help older people stay in the village Content – would like to see weight given to developments with more affordable housing (2nd respondent)	Local Plan requires all developments of 3 or more dwellings to have 35% affordable housing. Banding amended from 1-4 to 1-2
Flooding	Suggest increasing weighting given to 'flood risk'	Single comment. CLP strongly supported this view. Increase weighting for 5 – 10%

Views	Suggest all views to the hill are precious and should be captured in the assessment process	Already captured in the 'impact on valued views' criteria
Brownfield sites	Need to add weight to brownfield sites in a positive sense	Add 'brownfield site' criterion with 5% weight

Farmers Market 21st May 2017

Subject area	Comments recorded (some in conversation)	Response
S & I	Good to see the evidence is there for 19 houses over 14 years, not 44 houses in 2 years. We currently do not have the infrastructure to support mass housing – but more houses are required	Agreed as part of NP Plan. See Section 4.7.3
	All very encouraging, interesting, positive and sensible	Noted
S & I	We need the infrastructure - especially schools - to be better thought through and coordinated	We have a report from school governors regarding future development of school. See Section 7.3
Housing	Will the plan take into account what people propose to build in their back gardens?	Individual infill will be decided by planning authorities, but see Policy H2
Housing	Will the 19 provide social housing or will it be infill?	Affordable housing can only be a requirement in a build of 12 houses or more but there is a strong preference for a range of smaller houses including affordable housing - see H1
S & I	Sustainability and infrastructure are key – you need a 'light bulb' to get the community involved – positive scenarios	Noted
Housing	Key output will be protection for the village from large scale development.	Agreed. See Policy H1

	Small infill will be absorbed but another 'Jacks Meadow' could not be sustained either from a character perspective or because of traffic/infrastructure	

Farmers Market 18 June 2017

Subject area	Comments recorded (some in conversation)	Response
Views	Views of the countryside important from all parts of the parishes not just the hill	LCS analysis includes public views - see Section 3.5
	Views of the Faringdon Folly valuable	ditto
	Maintain the setting of St Mary's Church	In Conservation area. See Sections 4.8.6 and Policy H4
Housing	Do not build on School site in future	ditto
	Is common land treated as 'green space'?	See Section 3.7
Design	Illuminated advertisements are unattractive	See Policy D6
S&I	Traffic concerns include high speeds and parking	See Section 7.7
	Road improvements must be commensurate with new developments	ditto

Public consultation event 21 June 2017

Focus group	Subject area	Comment	Response
Design	Design Policy 1: re developers' attitude	Yes, this is so important. Standardised and 'diverse' designs can be seen throughout the county and indeed nationwide, so Uffington would look like everywhere else	Included in Section 5.1 and polices D1, D2
	Policy 2: building design	Limit dwellings to 1.5 storeys (in CAs) rather than 2 Yes absolutely. Could we encourage eco dwellings	Comment noted
	Policy 3D: dark sky	Absolutely agree with this. Often overlooked but is something	Included in Policy D6

		fundamental to maintaining the character of the villages. Based on description of architectural lighting, this is something I would encourage	Included in Policy D6
S&I	S&I Policy 2A & 2C Flooding	Resident advises terminology needs significant changes Need to divert water flow so Jubilee Field is drained and rain run-off does not flood the streets	Noted; see revised Policy S2 Not included
	Policy 3B & 3C Amenities	Safer crossing to village hall and shop Solar panels on public buildings for community benefit Electric points for cars Renewal programme for minibus 'Green' buildings to be encouraged Shared transport scheme	Not included Not included Included in Policy S3B Not appropriate for NP Not included See Section 7.7.1.
	Policy 4 Biodiversity	Should this policy on biodiversity go beyond just public space in new developments We should encourage native hedges rather than board fencing which is impenetrable and provides no nesting, food or shelter or wildlife 10 years ago, the village was teeming with frogs – very few remain. Why?	We rely on LP policies in this area, see Policy S1 Included in Policy D3 and S1B Noted see Section 7.5
Landscape	Landscape views	Add view to the hill across Jubilee field	See Section 3.5

Public consultation event 14 Nov 2017

Subject area	Comments	Response
LCS	General consensus that the LCS should be used as a basis for the NP policies Views to and from the White Horse should be preserved. Green fields and hedges within the village should be preserved as a unique feature	Agreed and incorporated Policy L1 Agreed. See Section 3 Local Green Spaces are defined in Policy L3. There is also protection of open spaces within conservation areas and common land.

LCS sites	177 no apparent access 133 should be red 179 should not be red 186 should not be red No notice should be taken of red areas when planning is made (individual comment supported by a small group) Why wasn't the Jubilee field red – inconsistent with the sports field. Should allotments be red? Blue patch next to Jacks Meadow must be amended	Access not addressed in LCS Latest map shows red Noted Noted Noted. See Policy L1 Comment noted – LCS criteria applied in both cases. However, they are identified as Local Green Spaces in Policy L3 This area will be properly defined in the final version
Housing policies H1	H1. Number of houses should be 'approximately' 19 houses. This is more appropriate than a minimum. H1. Housing type: a preference for 1-3 bedrooms with some 4 bedroom houses. Affordable houses: make houses flexible/modular to meet different needs If we have a small development there should be an integrated mix of size of homes to prevent isolation Need for bungalows for elderly/disabled people	Agreed in principle; see Policy H1 19 houses is for the NP area as a whole rather than there being an allocation for Baulking and Uffington. Agreed in principle Noted Agreed in principle Agreed in principle
H2	Support for individual houses being built but Infill should be limited so that the openness of the village remains. H2C. Individual comment: this could be seen as divisive. Perception perhaps that those in the most desirable area are immune to change and this enshrines that view perhaps Individual comment: Not 1.5 storeys There was a perception that a larger estate will bring more funds to the village A mix of comments: Individual houses and smaller developments of 3-5 houses with a maximum size of 10. Query – can we say the maximum size of development should mirror the minimum level to trigger affordable housing? An extension of Jacks Meadow was favoured by many –into 167 or 175	See H2 Noted No longer referred to in plan Noted See Section 4 Noted

H3 farm yards	Up to 5 houses but should be small and genuinely affordable, not large barn conversions.	See Policy H2
General	Should the policies encourage holiday cottages? How is the rest of the village being consulted? (spread of age and address) Sites should not be a traffic hazard Build a new school (NB the council would not pay)	Noted but not endorsed Through the 6-week consultation Noted Noted but not endorsed

Public consultation event 24 April 2018

Note there was considerable discussion concerning the HNA recommendation of a minimum of 19 additional houses.
Various points and responses recorded below

Comments	Response
'At least 19' could mean 120 !	Noted
There are enough parcels in the LCS map which are not red to accommodate 19	Agree
Could the number be more specific eg '19' or 'in the region of 19'?	Sympathetic to the finite 19 view, but the Vale is reluctant to accept a finite number or target, as not likely to be legal
Will vote against unless it is limited to 19	Reminded that to lose the referendum will mean no controls. A balance needs to be found.
Would infilling within the village count towards the 19?	Yes
Does the 19 include both Uffington and Baulking?	Yes
1. Does anybody want <u>any</u> new houses?' (especially as we already have Freemans, Waylands, Jacks Meadow etc?) 2. There is a need for housing for youngsters.	The HNA confirms the need, expressed by residents, for some additional houses. Note that a multitude of policies drive planning, not just

	the 19 from the HNA.
3. Baulking certainly does want some more houses	See Policy H3

2. Individual emails

RESIDENT A

Date	Comment	Date	Response
25/7/17	'**Impact on valued views including those to and from the AONB'**. I do question the view that development on the immediate south side of the village will necessarily be any more detrimental to the view from the hill than development anywhere else in the village. To the extent that infill development seems unlikely to fulfil our allocation from the Vale, perimeter development is inevitable and it will be visible from the hill, wherever it is placed. As to views **from** Uffington, surely any protection of views should be applied to **all** properties, not just those on the south side. Consider not only the views south from elsewhere within the village but the views that many properties enjoy in other directions as well. I think that views of sight-lines to St Mary's Church were also mentioned, but they do not appear in the spread sheet. Although the church is an important building and the environment around it should be protected, I am unsure on what basis views of the church from other buildings should take priority. '**Sector'.** What is the purpose of this point? If it is to protect the views from WHH, surely that is covered by the section 'Impact on valued views including those to and from the AONB'. If to protect the Conservation Area, it only does so in part and is already covered in the section 'Proximity to Conservation Area'. As it stands, assuming it is intended to	July 2017	The independent LCS analysis has taken in the various factors including views that a given development may affect. This analysis gives more emphasis to limiting development south of the village. The Vale has made no allocation. The HNA suggests 19 houses including Baulking so infill plus modest perimeter development is likely. The NP policies refer to protection of established public views (see 3.5) rather than private individuals' views. See 4.8.6, and Policy H4 The emphasis on valued views has been reduced and we will rely on the LCS analysis. See 3.5

	cover the views both of, and from, Uffington, the result is that these views are covered in both this section and also in 'Impact on valued views including those to and from the AONB' so receives a double (and heavy) weighting. If I am interpreting this correctly, I don't think this is justified.		
	'**Safety and convenience of the site access and impact of any on-road parking'.** 2% makes this relatively insignificant compared with other planning concerns and I believe that this is an important safety issue which should be given a much higher weighting. Parking on the village roads has increased dramatically in recent times, often making driving and manoeuvring hazardous. This is especially so either when forced by parked vehicles to travel on the wrong side of the road around corners or when pulling out of side turnings or entrances. Consider, for example, the entrance to the car park that now serves both the THMH and the new shop. Given the potential for a serious accident it is questionable whether this should have ever been allowed on the apex of a bend.		See Section 7.7
	· '**Proximity to the village envelope'.** I have been unable to find a copy of the village envelope map on the website. I did look at it at the meeting but cannot now remember the finer details. Is it possible to view it somewhere?		There is an historical map from 1970 but we do not now specify a permanent village envelope.
	· '**Number of Dwellings'.** The point was raised at the meeting that if the N.P. identifies potential building plots, the village would benefit financially if such developments were large enough to attract Section 106 funding rather than piece-meal developments of just a few houses dotted here and there.		The Plan is a non-allocating plan and does not now identify potential building plots.
	Another argument in favour of larger-scale development (as against infill) is the need to protect the character of the village – the certain variety and spaciousness of property layout that currently exists. If every available space (even relatively small		Our housing and design policies seek to protect the character of the village and include the issue of high density development.

	gardens) is exploited for development, this village character will quickly disappear. Could the planners suggest some criteria that could be factored in to downgrade sites that would result in over-density and/or alteration of the scale of the immediately surrounding properties? This is not dissimilar to protecting the conservation area and is possibly more important than preserving views. · **Common Land.** Several areas are proposed for some level of protection e.g. the conservation area. Conversely, brown field sites seem likely to be placed at the other end of the spectrum. I've found no mention anywhere though regarding protection of common land within the village. For example, most of the area between us and the village hall (including most of the gardens of Pond House and The Old Fire Station) is registered common land. This protected status should be reflected in the NP.		Common land benefits from a significant degree of protection from development. See Section 3.7

.

RESIDENT B

Date	Comment	Date	Response
24/11/17	As promised, we have given consideration to the information and documents presented at the recent meeting. With hindsight, it would perhaps have been beneficial if the meeting material could have been pre-circulated in order that the detail therein could have more fully explored during the course of the meeting, so do forgive the extent of the comments and observations below. The neighbourhood plan concept has been promoted on the basis that it would enable the community to determine policies on where, how much and what kind of development would be allowed in the neighbourhood area. Numerous benefits would flow, including a larger proportion of Section 106 payouts. A great deal of time and hard work has gone in	27/2/18	

	to the NP so far (for which, many thanks) but we seem to have ended up with the prospect of open ended development, subject only to a *minimum* number of 19 dwellings, with the proviso that all non-infill development should be concentrated solely around the northern perimeter. We've expressed before our views on the extent of the southern view weighting factored into the study criteria, but we are now where we are. Those on said northern perimeter may not agree with the outcome, but their views will carry little weight against those of the majority *not* resident on the northern perimeter. Thus, whilst financial benefit to the village (and landowners) will accrue, that benefit will to some extent be gained at the expense of those adjacent to the northern perimeter. Two fields particularly have been identified as possessing greatest development potential. Neither have access suitable for development. Nevertheless, as we abut one of the two fields identified, we have a particular interest in the draft policy circulated. We also abut a redundant farmyard and so are doubly interested. You will understand, therefore, that a lot of what follows is somewhat parochial in nature! **Comments/questions relating to the documents provided at the meeting:** **HOUSING POLICIES: UFFINGTON & BAULKING JOINT** **Policy 1 Number and Type of Houses** H1A This just seems now to only set a **minimum** of 19 dwellings within the Uffington/Baulking area, with no maximum and isn't linked with perceived/ demonstrable need. This surely leaves the northern perimeter alone open to unlimited development! What is the justification for this? How will the NP mitigate this possibility? **Policy 3 Building in Farmyards** H3 The barns and yard sandwiched between us and Manor Farm House are presumably treated under the policies as 'farmyard' and thus not 'built area'. Surely, if this site was ever to be developed, it should be treated no		The 19 additional dwellings reflect local needs (as concluded in the HNA) but, under Vale policy, there is no numerical ceiling on housing growth. Nevertheless, there are local factors which will make significant new housing over and above the 19 unsustainable in the plan area, see Section 4.7.3 Within the proposed policies there are a number of factors which will determine where building will be permitted outside the Uffington built area. These factors include the LCS conclusions, adjacency to the built area perimeter, and reasonable proximity to village facilities. Comments noted See comment above See Policy H2

	differently to any other infill site within the village for which far more restrictive policies seem to apply. Just about the only limitation applied to farmyards under the draft policies is a maximum number of 5 dwellings. Any maximum number quoted would likely become a developer's minimum and how would this work given that the actual *size* of farmyards will invariably differ? It would surely be more appropriate (and equitable) to apply the same/similar restrictions to those being proposed for other development scenarios (i.e. in keeping, proportionate in scale, non-dominant, etc. etc.) subject, possibly, to a catch-all maximum **density** criterion. Comments appreciated please. **HOUSING POLICIES UFFINGTON ONLY** HU2A i. We *think* we understand the definition of built-up areas although, as defined in the Housing Policies document, the 'built area' doesn't include gardens on the edge of the settlement. Trying to make sense of this in our context, it appears that our house and front garden are in the built-up area but our back garden isn't. This doesn't seem logical. Indeed, it seems to mean that any development along our rear boundary in area 177 could be regarded as development in the countryside because such development would not be 'adjacent to the built area'. Please would you elucidate? Again though, why are the restrictions that apply to building within the built area, not applied to building outside the built area (given that some of such development will about the built area)?		See policies H2
	ii. What does the phrase 'in the setting of the built area' mean?		ditto
	HU2B i. We were invited at the meeting to address the 'TBC' in HU2B. It has always been our view that, if development was to be imposed on the village, the burden should be spread equitably. Our view,		An equitable distribution of new development has deliberately not been considered. The LCS and other objective factors have determined the possible locations for potential development.

	particularly as the requirement for both villages together is *only* 19 dwellings in the next 14 years, is that TBC should be a low figure – 5 or 6 max. and that it should be combined with a maximum density limit. What are your views? HU3B ii. What is the definition of the word 'countryside' in this context? Does it mean completely separate and away from the village, not adjacent to any garden (see HU2A above) or not adjacent to any dwelling? **Comments/questions on matters raised at the meeting by us and various participants in our group** 1. For any new development, direct access to a road taking traffic away from the centre of the village is very desirable to avoid increasing the amount of traffic both past the entrance to the shop car park, which is already a potential danger spot due to the restricted view when leaving that area and re-joining the village road, and the village school, with the obvious health and safety concerns. 2. As mentioned previously, the two fields immediately behind us have seemingly been determined as the having the greatest capacity for development. There is no direct access to areas 175 & 177 from adopted roads, so how would these be accessed? Use of Lower Common Lane would contradict 1. above and, in any event, it is part road, part footpath, serving pedestrians from Jack's Meadow and the pre-existing houses. A specific footpath was built exiting the northern side of Jack's Meadow for exactly that purpose. It also links with the path across The Green, used regularly by young children to reach the village primary school, as well as providing a walking route to the Village Stores, the THMH and the Jubilee Field and play areas. As Lower Common Lane is very narrow with a blind bend some 20 metres from its junction with the main village road, any increase in cars would pose a serious danger to pedestrians,		It means beyond the built area. Comment noted The LCS does not consider access and related issues in its methodology.

	especially families with young children, disabled or elderly residents. We also note that the colouring selected for areas 175 & 177 extends not only on to the paddock immediately behind us (the boundary of which doesn't even appear on the Lepus plan) but also onto that part of the adjacent farm yard which runs immediately parallel to our western boundary, almost in suggestion of an access route. That part of the yard not only terminates on private property (mine) but would be unsuitable as an access anyway due to the proximity of buildings. Why is this colouring here anyway – that level of detail doesn't appear anywhere else on the Lepus plan?		Comment noted
	3. All of the areas to the south of the village, and some even within the centre of the village, have been identified by the Lepus study as having a low suitability for development. We understand that there is even talk of seeking protection for those areas. However, areas of the village that already have protection (e.g. Common/Open Access Land), and are thus unavailable for development, have somehow escaped this categorisation. Neither the original village green nor the Jubilee Field have been designated by Lepus. The former, which is of course in front of us, has already been allowed to be fenced and, in two cases (Pond House and The Old Fire Station) enclosed for garden – even the pond was filled in. It has thus, unfortunately, already been allowed to lose much of its open common appearance. Nevertheless, it does still have Common Land status, having been registered originally by Mrs Lowry, the previous resident of The Cottage on the Green, and confirmed when the Register of Common Land and Greens was compiled. The small fenced paddock adjacent to the village road is also Common Land. As we've said before, the valued/protected nature of these areas needs somehow to be recognised with the NP. Please advise.		re Common Land: see comment above under RESIDENT A's queries

	4. Flooding was repeatedly mentioned as a reason why some areas were deemed unsuitable for building. Please note that 177 floods in winter and, during particularly wet spells in the past, it has been flooded to at least ankle-height for prolonged periods. Finally, and as a general comment, we found the policies somewhat difficult to follow in their current form. A few specific comments thereon:- 5. In various places throughout the policies as currently drafted are references to 'permitting' development whilst in others the reference is to 'supporting' development. Why? 6. It might help if the definitions section was limited to just that – definitions. The policy aspects currently incorporated therein (i.e. b to g of the Limited Infill definition) could then be transferred where they surely belong in 'Policies'. 7. As currently drafted, the policies applicable to the different development scenarios are confused, inconsistent and difficult to interpret. It would be helpful to replace these with a matrix listing the different categories of development (e.g. building within that part of the built area which is within the conservation area, building in that part of the built area outwith the CA, building here, building there etc. etc.) along the top and the policy areas themselves (e.g. type, size, density, special considerations etc.) down the side. The actual policies could then be incorporated within that matrix. That would highlight the current inconsistencies and omissions and, once they are resolved, also help avoid misinterpretation post-referendum. It would be useful to see a copy of that when it is done. We hope this is helpful and we look forward to your comments.		Noted. To be included in flooding record if appropriate along with other fields. To be considered and remedied where appropriate Noted Noted

RESIDENT C

Date	Comment	Date	Response
13/7/17	Policy H2B I understand why the policy is proposed as there has been a trend to build 2.5 and 3 storey houses by developers seeking to maximise profits. However, the policy as drafted seems to me to open up the possibility of substantial development within the Conservation Area. Policy H2C seems sufficient to me.	1/18	See revised Policy H2 and H4
	Village envelope I am strongly opposed to expanding the village envelope to include Common Farm (Option B). The maps published on the Neighbourhood plan website are inconsistent. The 1970 village envelope shows that the small field between South View Farm and Shotover Corner is outside of the village envelope. The individual maps showing Option A and Option B suggest including this field within the village envelope. Confusingly the map with the different envelopes superimposed on top of each other shows this field outside of the village envelope for both Option A and Option B. It is therefore important to clarify what the proposed envelopes for Option A and B actually are. If indeed it is proposed that this field should be included in the village envelope I would oppose this as the field contains a rare and very old Black Poplar tree as well as valued views which are acknowledge in the draft valued views map.		Common Farm lies outside current built area The LCS shows this field as having low capacity for development as other fields south of Uffington. Existence of Black Poplar has been recorded in Plan, Section 7.5

	Valued views I note that one of the valued views is from Woolstone Road north west into the Paddocks. The location of the arrow on the map suggests that the view is valued from a position close to 1 Shotover Corner. I would argue that the best position to enjoy this view across the Paddocks is from the Woolstone Road adjacent to South View Farm so it would be better to move the arrow slightly to reflect this. This may seem like a pedantic point however a recent planning application which would have resulted in the loss of this view used the argument that the view could be enjoyed adequately across the garden of 2 Shotover Corner and that the development of these paddocks would not result in the loss of a valued view. I am concerned that as the map stands at the moment it could be used by a developer to make this argument.		We agree with this concern about the position of the arrow on the Valued Views map, but it has now been decided not to show a map of Valued Views within the Plan. The 'valued views' concept has been subsumed within the LCS Policy L1. Note para 3.5 regarding the preservation of public views as a consideration in other parts of the plan.

RESIDENT D

Date	Comment	Date	Response
28/11/17	We are writing to comment on the Uffington and Baulking Neighbourhood Plan, which we understand requires further funding and is likely to take another year to complete. The Community Led Plan (CLP) was carried out at a time when there was a real threat that Uffington could be forced to accept a large number of houses being built in and around the Village and it was not clear what might happen in Baulking and Woolstone. Since then, the District Council has completed a housing needs plan which has removed much of the threat of uncontrolled development. The Neighbourhood Plan, which has followed from the CLP	28/11/17	. The Neighbourhood Plan (NP) is now funded; the White Horse Show approved an application to part fund and part loan the required amount to complete the project. It may take up to a further year to complete the project but the majority of this time will be consultation and examination through the District Council (DC), in addition to the time it will take to run the referendum. The draft plan will be available for consultation from spring 2018. The NP will have legal status, once adopted, as part of the Development Plan. The DC can make planning decisions not

	began as a project involving the three villages of Baulking, Uffington and Woolstone but Woolstone withdrew, presumably when they saw that the District Council had put in place an approved housing needs plan. The Neighbourhood Plan has necessarily involved the employment of qualified advisers, which has cost a considerable amount of money. The goalposts changed this year, which added to the money required to carry the Plan forward and currently we understand the Plan requires at least another £7,000 to complete the work. Funding of the Plan has been from grants and to meet the shortfall of £7,000 the White Horse Show Trust have been approached. We did not attend the most recent public meeting in November and cannot comment on the outcome from this but we wish to raise the following questions, which we hope the Neighbourhood Plan Committee will take into consideration. iii. If the Plan is completed in the current timescale of a further year and with the increased expenditure of £7,000 , are we getting value for money? We realise a completed, approved plan will have legal status and must be considered when planning decisions are made but that does not stop the District Council Planning Authority overruling it or an independent government appointed inspector overruling the District Planning Authority in the case of an appeal. iv. To create an approved Neighbourhood Plan, we need consent from the District Planning Authority. Will our Plan differ significantly from their Plan? If it does, will they approve it? If it doesn't, why are we doing it? v. Members of the Neighbourhood Plan Committee have devoted a lot of their time and energy to reaching the current Plan status and the two villages must be grateful to the Committee for taking it this far. Will the villages still be grateful if the Plan continues to take time and further considerable amounts of money and		in accord with it, but only if material considerations in a particular case indicate the Plan should not be followed (see NPPF2018). However, the robust evidence we are gathering, with the DCs guidance, seeks to prevent that occurring, in addition to preventing legal challenge from developers. The main eventuality where the DC may go against the plan is if they lose their 5-year land supply. Our plan will be in accord with both the DCs Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework; if it was not, the independent examiner would not support it. However, importantly, it provides more detail set at a local level to better inform planning decision making. On your point about value for money, it is difficult to judge. The benchmark can only really be the cost of other adopted plans, many of which have cost in the same order of magnitude. Most of the expense has been consultant support, but while this is expensive, it has provided the professional support and independence we have needed to bring the plan to its current maturity, with the level of evidence behind it that the DC mandated in order to support it. All the volunteers on the NP Steering Group (SG) are fully committed to completing the plan and the worth it will deliver when adopted. No green spaces have been allocated without landowner agreement. Every potential green space identified had an identical letter sent to the relevant landowner seeking their engagement on whether they wished their land to be

	will they start to question what it is for? vi. The Committee, with the involvement of payed advisers, has identified areas of land that are said to be more or less suitable for housing development. It has identified areas that are suggested to be classified as 'green', which we understand would make it very difficult to carry out any housing development on them. While the Committee has presented these proposals publically, we do not believe they have first consulted with landowners or with residents who might be directly affected by these proposals. Members of the Committee are volunteers but have not been appointed by any form of election process and therefore cannot be expected to represent the views of the community unless they engage with interested parties before making proposals. We hope the Committee will consider these questions carefully and take what action is needed to ensure they carry the will of the public in Baulking and Uffington and avoid the risk of being seen as an isolated organisation, spending large sums of public money on a plan that does not necessarily achieve what villagers want.		considered. We were clear in the letters that their agreement was a prerequisite to taking any allocations forward. Of 13 land parcels under consideration, 4 will be protected as green space. Once the draft plan is complete, we will again formally consult with the community and some government agencies, including of course the DC, for a minimum of 6 weeks. We hope you will be able to take part in this activity.

RESIDENT E

Date	Comment	Date	Response
31 /7/17	I have recently been made aware of the proposed policy regarding Uffington views and am very disappointed that I was not even consulted in the first instance in this regard,	8/17	The legislation surrounding the drafting of neighbourhood plans requires residents of areas, designated for NPs by the local council, to be consulted throughout. The

	especially given that a number of the proposed views fall across my currently owned land. Moreover, I will now seek and engage professional support to contest such proposals in the strongest possible manner. It's not surprising that the proposed views to be protected and as supported by the parish council members do not seem to fall over any land owned or occupied by themselves.		Steering Group for the Uffington and Baulking NP has been doing that since the work started early last year. The NP website holds a wealth of detail about the progress of the plan and the quarterly Courier contains an update. A number of public consultation events open to all residents have been held - the latest was on 21 June 2017. This was widely advertised and 50 people attended. At that event the Steering Group's latest proposals were discussed with the audience, and comments invited. The Steering Group is currently pulling together the comments made and incorporating them into the evolving policies which will go into the draft NP. Further comments are always welcome and can also be made via the website. The following link will take you to the NP website and the consultation events which have been held: https://www.ubwnp.net/public-consultation/ The map of the proposed 'Valued Views' is in the process of being revised as a result of comments made on 21 June and if you wish, I will send it to you on completion. [valued views map has now been removed from the plan.]
31/8/17	Thanks for dropping the note over re open spaces. I have read it briefly and notice that there is not any reference to the values views policy. When we spoke the other day, I got the impression that for technical reasons, valued views was not a path that the NP would adopt and that Green Spaces would in fact fill that gap with regard to long term preservation of specific areas - subject to the necessary acceptance by landowners etc Can you confirm that my understanding is correct? In addition, I think you also mentioned that I would receive a response to my letter submission regarding values views to	24/1/18	The 'Valued Views' has been subsumed within the LCS Policy L1. Note para 3.5 regarding the preservation of public views as a consideration in other parts of the plan. Local green spaces are covered in para 3.6 and Policy L3.

	the NP committee. Is that still forthcoming?		
31/8/17	Following my previous correspondence and meetings with Mr R Hart and Mr S Jenkins on 7th August and subsequent attendance to the NP steering committee on the evening of 10th August at the THMH, I wanted to reaffirm our significant objection to the proposed policy and approach being suggested. Our objection partly relates to the use of the policy as a planning approval and development avoidance tool, that is, in addition to the already stringent set of planning conditions applicable to conservation area guidance, within which our property sits. In plain terms – this is the existing policy under which planning and development is controlled and supressed and is the policy enforced at the time that we acquired the Walnuts and its land. To have a new, and further level of control and enforcement on our property is simply unacceptable from our perspective. We see the existence and even suggestion of this proposed policy as highly contentious which would place an unnecessary control on our land, breaching our Human rights under Article 1 of 1st Protocol of the Human rights act 1998 (Protection of Property). There is, as you will know, significant case law in support. As previously stated, and as the land owners, we purchased both the Walnuts and adjacent parcel of land many years ago in the knowledge that these properties are contained within the conservation area and as subject to many planning restrictions and reductions in PDR's. We did not purchase the property in the knowledge of an overlaying series of additional constraints would be considered or imposed after purchase. We would strongly urge the committee to remove any views that affect directly or indirectly the Walnuts property or indeed the complete removal of the proposed policy itself. As I have already suggested, we are fortunate enough to live in a village	5/2/18	Objections, comments and proposed actions noted

	with a protected conservation area already established which already provide adequate protection. In the meantime, we are now obligated to protect our property and its flexible use over the long term as much as possible. Moreover, we cannot accept the implied constraints that this policy will bring. As you will know, we did not submit our land for consideration for future development under the 'call for land' request some time ago – this should, in our opinion, have been sufficient demonstration of our intentions in terms of development. To provide the committee with a transparent perspective of the severity, impact and importance that the proposed policy has on us, we believe that it is fair for the committee to understand the actions already taken and those under consideration: - **Actions Taken** 1. Property valuation exercise initiated to determine pre- and post-policy differentials 2. Engagement and retention of planning and policy professional support 3. Instruction to hedge maintenance contractors to completely cease trimming of any bordering hedges to the entire property, other than that which is deemed absolutely and legally necessary. The hedge depths will be increased on my land side as required to eliminate any clear lines of sights or views. 4. Evaluation as to current Permitted Development Rights availability and the exercising of such rights. 5. Selection process commenced for the identification and retention of an independent landscape assessment professional. 6. Initial contact with a limited number of other affected landowners 7. Review of additional crop planting and land usage		

	options that provides maximum protection from any proposed policy. 8. Initial assessment of planning and development options within the current property curtilage. **Actions under consideration** At the meeting on 10th August, the committee did in fact acknowledge my concerns and requested that I defer any further and additional actions until the committee had undertaken further assessment of the proposed policy. Based on that suggestion, I will await further clarification until the end of October 31st, 2017, following which I will need to progress with my own plans to gain the necessary local adoption, any local authority approvals and legal inputs should this be required. I do hope that this provides you with a clear appreciation of our concerns and actions regarding the proposed policy. If, however, you require any further information or clarification, please do not hesitate to contact me.		