Uffington and Baulking Neighbourhood Plan

CONSULTATION STATEMENT: APPENDIX 4

Developers/Agents' Comments on 6-week Pre-Submission Plan

NFA = No Further action required

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.

ADVISOR A

Date	Comment	Date	Response
26Jun18	Extract from letter: I wrote to you on behalf of [names redacted] on 1st March 2018. This formal consultation response broadly covers the same points as that representation. There is an additional point. You responded via email from Rob Hart on 18/03/18 to that representation however my clients remain unsatisfied with the response. Mr Hart's email failed to address any of the points raised. It served only to acknowledge the representation. The previous responses from Lepus Consulting served more as professional disclaimers than answers to the points raised. I note Mr Hart's email states that advice has been sought from the VWHDC on the matter. My clients contacted the VWHDC regarding the advice given. We understand that the VWHDC did not comment on the points raised, advising you only that as you had answered the query, my clients would have to make further submission if they remained unhappy. My clients feel that the Steering group has not fully appreciated the points that were raised. As such no amendment has been made to the UBNP, which my clients request.		Noted

Date	Details	Date	Response
	My clients continue to feel that the Landscape Capacity Study and the policies which follow from it, policies L1 and L2, are in need of amendment. The reasons are set out below, I will elaborate on each in turn. Further, my clients are unhappy with the overuse of the term “setting of the AONB” and feel that the Local Green Space designation is without grounds. Reasons: 1. The methodology of the LCS, in particular Table 8, is weighted in favour of finding sites to be of “Low Capacity”. 2. The LCS is a strategic “high level” study, however, it has been carried out at a site specific “low level”. Policy L1 (Landscape) is informed by the LCS, in particular Table 9, at an application site specific level, creating a situation of predetermination of the normal planning process. 3. Policy L2, which requires a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment to be submitted with any development proposals within the LCS coloured area is not supported by any local or national policy and creates an unreasonable burden on applicants. 4. The term “setting of the AONB” is widely used within the LCS methodology table for determining site classifications. The AONB was designated during in 1974. It is felt likely that at that time, the persons responsible almost certainly carried out assessments to define exactly where the AONB would be delineated. They chose the line to be the B4507, known locally as the top road. They chose not to include the Parishes of Uffington and Baulking, or any other Downland Parishes, despite almost certainly having local knowledge of them and the wider Vale of the White Horse. It is accepted that areas directly adjacent to the AONB might be found to be within its setting, and that some major planning applications, for instance wind pumps, will affect the AONB. However, it is felt that the designation “setting of the AONB” has been far too widely used within the LCS, with the effect of unreasonable pushing sites toward the “Low” end of the capacity determination tables. The edge of Uffington is some 1.1miles for		NFA - The Landscape Capacity Study (LCS) and the Housing Needs Assessment (HNA) were commissioned from external, independent, consultants and accepted by the SG as such. They cannot now be changed. (see meeting held 16.8.18 reported in Appendix 8.) Following meeting on 16.8.18 (see Appendix 8) SG made change to policy L2 regarding LVIA requirement NFA – SG does not agree with this analysis of AONB setting and the visibility of the church and/or potential development from the escarpment. LCS to stand (see above)

Date	Details	Date	Response
	the B4507. From that point, and from White Horse Hill, St Mary's Church is a dot on the Landscape and many of the "setting of the AONB" sites are simply too far away to be notable. In particular the sites owned by my clients. It is, therefore, requested that this be reviewed. 5. Local Green Space. The UBNP designates 4 sites as Local Green Space (LGS). The evidence base provides reasons why the Jubilee Field may be considered local in character (specific planting of trees in 1992 etc) as required by the NPPF. However, for the other 3 sites the evidence base provides only a description of the sites. There is no evidence for these sites. They do not meet the criteria for begin designated as LGS.		NFA. SG is satisfied with its application of Local Green Space criteria.

ADVISOR B

06Jun18	Extract from letter: On behalf of Redcliffe Homes Ltd I would make the following comments on the Plan. I hope these comments will enable you to include land to the north of Fawler Road and to the east of Station Road, Uffington, SN7 7SL (the Site) as a housing allocation to meet identified local housing needs for market and affordable housing. Main points: • Meets the required 19 dwellings in an explicit way • Does not believe that the 19 can be met (from infill) without going outside the built area. • Includes affordable homes • Generate CIL to be used for the benefit of all residents		NFA – SG confirmed NP to be non-allocating. There is also a desire not to allocate the whole of the recommended 19 dwellings to a single site. The NPSG noted in this submission several constructive points and corrections. These have been addressed.

Date	Details	Date	Response

ADVISOR C

10Jun18	Extract from letter: On behalf of [name redacted] I would make the following comments on the Plan. I hope these comments will enable you to remove the references to the Uffington Trading Estate (UTE) from the Plan, or reword the relevant passages to remove reference to the UTE. As a result of the planning history, continuing objections made and restrictions placed on the UTE the development of the site has not progressed apace with the planning permissions that have been achieved. Whilst this may well have something to do with the location of the UTE, and its origins as a tip which can be a costly consideration in building on the site, it is understood that in any event no employee at the UTE resides in the Plan area.		NFA – references to be retained. UTE is the key site for any industrial activity in the Plan area and underpins policy EE1. The SG is somewhat surprised to receive this request when it had sought to promote the site – albeit within necessary traffic and environmental constraints.

ADVISOR D

12Jun18	Extract from letter: On behalf of South West Strategic Developments (SWSD) and the landowners of land east of Fernham Road, Grass Roots Planning have been instructed to prepare representations to the Uffington and Baulking Neighbourhood Plan (NP) to promote our clients' land for allocation. Main reasons given are that the 20 homes proposed would: • Include 7 affordable homes, be a mix of 2, 3, and 4 bedroom houses and bungalows as recommended by the HNA • Provide more open space • Provide new footpath access for residents to the centre of the village • Generate increased footfall for local businesses • Provide parking for the Uffington allotments • Generate CIL to be used for the benefit of all residents		NFA . SG confirms NP to be non-allocating. There is also a desire not to allocate the whole of the recommended 19 dwellings to a single site.