Uffington and Baulking Neighbourhood Plan

CONSULTATION STATEMENT: APPENDIX 3

Resident's Comments on 6-week Pre-Submission Plan

Note: References in the **Comments** column 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.

NFA = No Further action required
Please note that this appendix starts at 'RESIDENT F' to follow on from 'RESIDENT E' in Appendix 1

RESIDENT F

Date	Comment	Date	Response
8/5/18	Via shop Thank you for the Executive Summary of the draft NP. Thank you all so very much for the huge amount of work, and for your expertise. I am totally happy with the Plan, understanding the housing needs. I was pleased to see Housing H1: "housing suitable for older people". Affordable housing must be realistically affordable – as it is vital that the diversity of this exceptional village is maintained.		See 4.7.4 and Policy H1

RESIDENT G

5/18	Via shop 1. The following are needed in Uffington village: • public toilets • salt bins • speed limit enforced		Not NP points Passed to PC for info/action

Date	Comment	Date	Response
	• 2 defibrillators, one at the Fox & Hounds, another at the village hall so both sections of the village would benefit 2. Parking by pub customers in front of bungalow at 1 Patricks Orchard is a problem and happens even when pub car park is not full. 3. There has been an old Land Rover parked in the lower car park in Patricks Orchard for well over 10 years and it has never been moved. 4. As for housing, I think more housing for OAPs is needed		Policy H1 covers housing for older people

RESIDENT H

20/05/18	Comment at Farmers Market We do not think any more houses are needed in Uffington village, based on the following evidence: only one house of the 35 available in the new estate of Jacks Meadow was acquired by an existing resident of Uffington.		NFA – HNA (19) stands.

RESIDENT I

14/05/18	Via email Regarding the Neighbourhood Plan. The whole purpose of David Cameron's "pushing" democracy down to the general population, is in serious danger of being ignored by the local authorities, as they have provided advice to the parish council that is clearly intended to be wholly in their interest. The excellent work carried out by your committees in formulating the Neighbourhood Plan, is primarily to exercise control over the number; style; and location of future building developments in the village. By including the words "at least 19 " is a complete negation of that purpose. We must ignore the advice of the County/District councils, and use a more limiting choice of words, such as "in the region of" or "approximately". if the plan is put forward unchanged in this critical respect, [my wife] and I will have no option but to vote against the plan in the upcoming referendum, notwithstanding the realisation that we would then be left defenceless. But in itself in no different from "at least", which is so open ended as to offer no defence at all.		Change wording in H1 to 'In the region of 19 in the parishes of Uffington and Baulking'

Date	Comment	Date	Response

RESIDENT J

23/05/18	Via email The debate around the “at least 19 dwellings”. In the policy the wording could be amended to “ ….Plan period from 2018 to 2031 it is recommended that 19 new dwellings are required...”		Covered by reworded policy H1

RESIDENT K

29/05/18	Via email • Page 7 – Housing, reference H1: Much work has gone into assessing the number of houses which it is anticipated will be needed in the plan period. The phrase ‘at least 19’ conveys a message that the plan endorses open ended development. • Page 8 – Design, reference D2 : The map on page 25 suggests two fields as ‘Medium capacity’. An inspection of those sites will show that they afford views of the Ridgeway and WH Hill, and one of the two has a public footpath running across it, enhancing access to the views. The map tends to contradict D2. • Page 18 – Objectives, number 1.: It is possible, even likely, that a reasonable proportion of the existing population would regard the field fronting onto Station Road, Uffington, and immediately north of Fox Cover as the obvious site for modest additional housing. A logical assumption is that the design of existing housing even anticipated this possibility. As an aside, is it not possible that the infrastructure costs of a small development on the two fields referred to in our para 2, which is a fairly remote location, would be a deterrent to development (including the costs of responding to P.46, D5)? • Page 28 – Common Land. : The Green, Uffington is common land, as stated. Its value as a green space is much valued by villagers, particularly ‘old’ Uffington families (whose roots go back further than our own 30 years). Common land enjoys a significant measure of protection but why did the SG think it inappropriate to designate this and other sites as LGS without landowner agreement – assuming, as we do, that they share the		Covered by reworded policy H1 NFA - LCS stands. Scoring within LCS includes footpath and views as factors. NFA – Objectives not to be changed at this stage. Plan to remain non-allocating NFA – points noted Text in section 3.7 has been expanded to cover protection from development on Common Land. Green Space allocation requires landowner consent in this NP

Date	Comment	Date	Response
	view that they should be preserved? The additional weight of the NP to the protection already afforded would be valuable, and support the efforts made by earlier residents of the Cottage on the Green, who we believe registered this particular common a number of years ago. • Page 29 – Vale of the White Horse District Local Plan: The second bullet point seems to support the observation in our para 3 above and militate against the sites referred to in our para 2 (…development must be adjacent, or well related, to the existing built areas….). • Page 41 – Policy H2: Again, 'B : Outside the built area of Uffington village' and the thinking behind the map on page 25 seem to be at odds with each other, and presumably the map would carry weight with planners. • Page 55 - New arrivals to Uffington already experience the ridiculous situation of struggling to get school places. We are not affected by this, but the position seems more serious than the draft plan might suggest. • Transport services – It is optimistic to convey hopes of extending existing community services which rely on volunteers. There are a few younger volunteers, who are greatly appreciated, but generally the current minibus service depends on retirees and the prospects for finding replacements are discouraging. The recent influx of new residents has done nothing to help.		NFA – noted ('adjacent sites' applies only to smaller villages or allocating plans) Policy H2 modified Comment noted. Chair of Governors confirms that situation is dynamic. School has some places at present but not necessarily for ages required. See revised section 7.3

RESIDENT L

6/06/18	Via email Inevitably, our comments very much reflect those expressed in relation to earlier consultations (see email of 24th November 2017). 5.7.1 Housing Needs Assessment. Careful and detailed listing of the number of dwellings already built set against the perceived need for Uffington and Baulking comes to the conclusion that 'a further 19 dwellings are proposed in the remainder of the period to 2031.' This seems reassuring. However, in the Executive Summary and Policy H1, this is stated as 'at least 19 new dwellings are required in the Plan area'. This a significant change in meaning to that outlined in 5.7.1. and runs counter to the originally declared		Covered by reworded policy H1

Date	Comment	Date	Response
	objective of the Neighbourhood Planning process. Essentially, whilst this is presented as a non-allocating plan, future development is very clearly linked to the LCS which itself is biased in favour of development to the north of the village – even more specifically to the fields behind The Green/Lower Common. The reference to 'at least 19 dwellings', regardless of the wording in 5.1.7, presents the prospect of developer/landowner pressure for more extensive development in this location in the near or medium term.		NFA – LCS stands but note that (many) other factors considered in planning applications
	5.5 Historic Housing Development in Uffington. Figure 13: The Common Land status of The Green appears to have been misunderstood. In Figure 13 it is included in the area coloured blue to indicate it was part of the 1970's development. The common land status of the Green was secured and documented many years before the limited housing development and, of course, 'The Cottage on the Green' was in existence decades before, therefore neither should be described/coloured as such. This is an error and needs to be corrected on the documentation.		Map to be amended/corrected
	Figure 7: In 1970 'The Green' was, and indeed should still be, a completely open common in the style of The Green in Baulking. In this connection, as the green spaces map to be incorporated within the Neighbourhood Plan will doubtless assume considerable significance in years to come, it should reflect ALL green spaces – whether newly designated or already in possession of designation. This could be done very simply by incorporating the relevant area of common land comprising 'The Green' in Figure 7 too and shading it in a different colour to distinguish it from the additional green spaces proposed.		Map to be amended to include Common Land – but separately from LGS (which is a different designation)
	The plan continues to apply special restrictions to infill development within the so-called built area. Yet it applies no equivalent restrictions to development on land immediately adjacent to the built area nor even to 'infill' land that is effectively surrounded by built area.		NFA – adjacent land excluded in accordance with Vale LPP1 policy
	On a final point, given the age profile of Uffington and the number of larger houses than will likely become single occupancy in the coming years, it is disappointing not to see any specific reference to a modest Penstones-type development (Stanford in the Vale) that could free these up and possibly avoid new housing development.		NFA - this is generically covered in policy H1 by 'homes for older people' but is dependent on open market forces and site availability.

Date	Comment	Date	Response
	There are many details included in the Plan that are good to see included, such as the height of new dwellings, materials used, size of dwelling related to plot size etc. Uffington has become rather a hotchpotch of building styles and materials which detracts from the cohesion and attractiveness of our village and it is very encouraging that you and your committee have considered such aspects.		NFA – already a variety of styles from over the years

RESIDENT M

9/06/18	Via email I have 2 comments which both relate to Focus Group Area - Housing, Objective 1,2,4 and Policy Reference H1; *Over the remainder of the Plan period from 2018 to 2031, at least 19 new dwellings are required in the Plan area:*		
	a. The prefix of 'at least' before the figure 19. My understanding is that this was not the finding of the assessment work that was commissioned and it also leaves an open ended upper figure for housing, with no control, guide or suggestion given by the NP as to what that upper limit might be.		See revised policy H1
	b. The descriptor of 'required' relating to the new dwellings. Whilst the assessment might have suggested that 19 dwellings were required when combined with the terminology of 'at least' this puts a degree of imperative over more housing, ie more than 19 are required. The overall effect is to suggest that a range of between 19 and an infinite number of houses are essential in Uffington and Baulking, which I understand was not the finding of the assessment and therefore I imagine not the intention of the authors.		See revised policy H1
	I appreciate from the consultation meetings that legal advice (sponsored by the VOWH) is offered to groups drawing up NPs and that this advice suggested that a plan should not be restrictive in its wording, if it is the plan might be rejected? I suggest that the current wording takes this advice one step too far and rather than being more open, it is unbounded.		All points covered by reworded policy H1

Date	Comment	Date	Response
	I suggest, and I am sure you have considered, that there is a middle ground. You will come up with the language of course and I am sure others have suggested wording including 'in the region of/around/approximately 19 new dwellings', and so on. With this tighter language over the numerical aspect, the term 'required' is more palatable, but perhaps desired or necessary softens it further? I appreciate that there is a risk that this wording may be viewed by VOWHDC as restrictive and the villages (and Steering Group) would need to go through another consultation and appeal type process. My opinion is that on balance it is worth taking that chance; there is nothing to lose at this stage. I suggest however that something like *Over the remainder of the Plan period from 2018 to 2031,* **in the region** *of 19 new dwellings are* **desired** *in the Plan area,* is not restrictive but loosely bounded? Ultimately of course words mean things.		NFA – 'required' retained as in HNA

RESIDENT N

6/06/18	Via shop 1. There needs to be a limit regarding the extent of build, in order to maintain the cohesion and character of the village.		Covered by reworded policy H1
	2. As regards building plots, the sight line towards White Horse hill and the Ridgeway should be kept clear, as it is now. Possible plots could be near the Westminster bridge/Woolstone Road area. Any building should be in groups, not strung along the roadsides.		NFA – factored into LCS NFA – ribbon development covered – to be resisted
	Having seen the roads flooded, the stream which runs around the village would also need to be kept clear. I have seen children with canoes in two places which were flooded, near the Police House towards Woolstone Road and near the museum, down towards Fernham Road.		NFA – Flooding policy S2 and Ref Doc L
	As regards Baulking, any build would ruin the tranquillity of the village. Anything built would need to be almost hidden in order to retain that peaceful green space.		Noted

Date	Comment	Date	Response
	If industrial building is needed I would suggest that the area at the back of the old Station Hotel, which already contains, I believe, car repair works. 3. Seeing the number of children in the school, it must fast be growing short of space, prompting the question where and how can it be enlarged. As students progress to attend KA's at Wantage, followed by 'Uni' or apprenticeships, it poses further problems with transport. With all the cars now parked along the streets, the question is why can't we have a bus service back. A regular reliable service will become a necessity. The number of cars parked on the roadside leaves little room for emergency services vehicle access, which must be taken into consideration. 4. Any build needs to be of similar style and character to that which already exists.		Chair of Governors stated that situation is dynamic. School has some places at present but not necessarily for ages required. NFA – Bus service unlikely to be reinstated because county subsidy unlikely to be reintroduced. NFA – covered by Design policies

RESIDENT O

13/06/18	Via email We comment as follows on the draft plan on which views are canvassed. First, we commend the group on the thoroughness of its work and thank the participants for undertaking this project, both to enhance and protect the village. We know many hours have been spent on the work. Whilst we agree with much of the content, there are 3 points which concern us and which we feel are at risk of negating the objective of helping provide some protection against random housing development. We hope the group may consider these and take them into account in further drafts. • The plan identifies a need for 19 new houses over the plan life, beyond those already built; however, the wording of the executive summary and plan refers to AT LEAST 19 dwellings being required. We note that from para 5.7.3 that the VWHDC does not allow a maximum cap to be applied in plans but we feel that the current wording simply plays into the hands of interested landowners and developers. It offers no protection at all against a future "Gladman-style" application. Whilst we recognise that the plan may be over-ridden by the VWHDC, we should not make it easy for them to do		NFA - Covered by reworded policy H1

Date	Comment	Date	Response
	so. We ask that an alternative form of words be found to make quite clear that our plan is specifically for 19 dwellings. Any build number beyond that would be against the perceived needs and wishes of the community. • We note that the triangular paddock on Fawler Road adjoining Craven Common is designated as “medium/low suitability” for development. We think this is unwise as it will invite application for development. Previous applications have been refused on grounds which include the impact on the view from the White Horse Hill. The plan is at pains to protect the quality of the environment, particularly on the south side of the village and the inclusion of this plot undermines your efforts in that respect. We believe that, if development of this plot were allowed, it would make easier any subsequent application to develop the filed which borders Upper Common Lane, development which would entirely negate the objective of the plan. • We are surprised at the proposed designation as “medium suitable for development” of land north of Lower Common Lane. We believe that the building of any significant number of houses here would present significant problems of access and an element of congestion around the entrance to the Green, opposite the shop. We would have thought a much more obvious site for development would have been the field on the north side of Station Road behind the recent Jack’s Lea development, which would provide direct access to Station Road with minimum intrusion on the rest of the village. The site is already screened by trees to provide privacy. We ask that these points be taken into account when modifications to the plan are considered, so that we support it.		NFA – LCS stands NFA – LCS stands but note that (many) other factors considered in planning applications

RESIDENT P

24/6/18	Via email Baulking Resident. Public consultation meetings have been well attended by Baulking residents in a genuine belief that Baulking villagers may have their views favourably considered and hopefully inputted into future planning applications - see overwhelming support for new housing in Baulking Housing Needs Survey.		NFA - The decision to include a Baulking Only Housing Policy, H3, seeks to address the highlighted concerns and endorses the responses to the initial CLP, and the NP

Date	Comment	Date	Response
	Baulking is a unique village, with a very strong community spirit - this being the very reason that many of us wish to move out of our large family homes into smaller houses which do not exist within Baulking. The village is slowly dying - our children cannot afford to return, and their parents are 'house locked'. Planning Officers need to be aware that some people are 'country' people, have been all their lives, and would be very unhappy to live anywhere else but in a rural area. The Landscape Survey shows two 'medium' sites within Baulking parish, so please look closely at these regarding new house builds, alongside the evidence and support for needing new builds within the Plan relating to Baulking (although not the same views regarding housing in Uffington and originally Woolstone) Finally, my husband and I have supported the Neighbourhood Plan, helping and commenting when opportune, so please do not let this Neighbourhood Plan be seen as 'an illusion of democracy' but a realistic, genuine, democratic Plan.		Housing Needs Survey/Assessment and LCS. NFA – noted but NP to remain non-allocating

RESIDENT Q

24/6/18	Via email My comment relates to this paragraph: “Over the remainder of the Plan period from 2018 to 2031, at least 19 new dwellings are required in the Plan area. Development proposals that provide a range of housing types will be permitted, particularly where the dwelling mix provides for: 1. Affordable housing 2. Housing suitable for young people/families 3. Housing suitable for older people There will be a strong preference for developments that provide primarily for smaller dwellings.” First, I think the phrase "at least 19 new dwellings will be required" should read "the evidence suggests that 19 new dwellings will be required". I cannot see the evidence for suggesting that more than 19 will be required. Second, I think "will be permitted" should change to "will be preferred". Using the		

Date	Comment	Date	Response
	word permitted implies too strongly that developments that are referred to will be allowed. Third, I think "strong preference" should change to just "preference". I can understand the desire to prefer developments that provide primarily for smaller dwellings; but bigger houses don't always mean a lot more expensive houses and there can be large families as well as small.		NFA - Covered by reworded policy H1

RESIDENT R

5/6/18	Via email Having now read all 61 pages of the Uffington & Baulking Neighbourhood Development Plan 2011-2031, I just wish to comment as below. I am in support of the plan in general however as an owner of a large house currently in the village of Baulking I do believe there is a need for some smaller properties, (up to 4 bedroom) being built in the village to allow either young people to get on the housing ladder, people who want to downsize and stay in the village and free up the current larger housing for younger families to keep the village alive, so to speak, or build the smaller properties to encourage new families/singles/couples to live in the village of Baulking. Other than that, the plan is excellent.		Noted. NFA - the specific point about Baulking housing is addressed through Policy H3, and the mix of housing types is addressed in policy H1 of the UB-NP.