

DRAYTON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN 2014 – 2029

Pre-Submission Consultation Copy

Observations:

The preparation of the Plan has obviously involved a great deal of effort. The commitment of those directly involved in its' preparation is commendable. However, regrettably, in its' present detail, the document is not acceptable and unless it is significantly modified we will not support it in the forthcoming Referendum. Further, we will do all we can to encourage others to reject it in its' present form.

Any consideration of the document encounters difficulty because of the duplication of some paragraph numbers; paragraph 127 concludes on page 57. The first paragraph on page 58 is number 113; this results in all paragraph numbers in the range 113 – 127 being duplicated. In consequence, the following paragraph references are given together with the appropriate page number to ensure they are correctly identified.

Whilst some of our concerns may be regarded as pedantic, perhaps unsurprisingly, our primary concern relates to Potential Development Sites; particularly Barrow Road. These concerns are mentioned in para 16, p 10 but are not specified or mentioned again elsewhere in the document.

At the public meeting on 18 October 2013, Barrow Road was listed no. 2; Manor Farm site, as both physical and functional centre of the village was logically no. 1. Barrow Road is now no. 1 on the list (para 114 p44). What is the significance of this change? The implication being it is intended to be the first site to be developed?

At the public meeting on 18 October, the detail provided for each site included a site layout plan for each site; in particular showing the specific part of each area where houses should/would be built and their relation to green spaces. In the Consultation document, this approach is adopted only in Figure 3, in the Plan Policies section (para 49, p 19/20) in relation to the Manor Farm site. **It is essential to adequate assessment of the document that this detail is provided consistently for each proposed site.**

A further inconsistency along these lines currently exists in the document as presented. With regard to South of the High Street Site Description (para 123, p 52) reference is made to “**one advantage of the size is that there is ample space to include buffer zones of green space and public open space, so that new housing could be well separated from existing housing**”. Greater consistency would be achieved by appropriate, similar qualification, together with associated outline layout plans for each site. In particular, for Barrow Road, the qualifications specified in para 115 (p 46) should read along the lines:

115. This site is on the northern fringe of the village, located to the rear of the houses on the west side of Abingdon Road (with 15 properties fronting the unmade service road and 3 directly off Abingdon Road) and 5 houses to the north of Barrow Road. The proposal is for housing with new playing fields sufficient to accommodate two football pitches and possibly a cricket pitch or some other usage, as determined by village demand. **As with other sites, there is ample space to locate the housing so that both existing and new can overlook the recreational space.** (Supported by an outline plan.) Although these facilities would

obviously be separated from the existing football pitch next to the Village Hall, they would provide valuable additional recreational space, which has been historically difficult to obtain in Drayton. As with all new housing sites, this would impact on traffic flows through the village: it is envisaged that the main access would be from Abingdon Road where it enters the village, probably from a mini-roundabout which would also serve Sutton Wick Lane. Such wording would then comply with the footnote of page 42.

The last sentence of para 115 (p 47) as drafted should be omitted. Whilst it could be used as a general statement, possibly located appropriately under "TRANSPORT", it is **incorrect** to say that traffic heading south (from the Barrow Road site roundabout, as described) might **not** pass through the village. It will!

Other detailed comments:

The opening paragraph(p 5) of the Foreword to the document indicates that the consultation process involved three well-attended public meetings. Using the attendance figures for these meetings, the best attendance is not more than 11% of the adult population of the village. Whilst this may be good in comparison to other meetings of this type, can they really be described as "well attended"?

Further, the assertion is made that concerns expressed at public meetings were tested in a questionnaire distributed throughout the village; implying that the questionnaire was circulated after the last of the 3 meetings (4 if the Jubilee gathering is included). In fact, it was circulated after the 2nd meeting and concerns raised at the 3rd meeting were not covered by the questionnaire.

Additionally, at least some of those significant concerns which were raised at the 3rd meeting on October 18 are ignored in the Consultation Copy even though those concerns are referred to in para 16, p10 (Community Engagement) without being identified.

Para 116, p 47: If it is correct to indicate that the views of people living in the properties along the Abingdon Road service road, in Barrow Road (there are none on the north side) and the three bungalows directly on Abingdon Road will be affected, how can it be accurate to say there would be little impact on the surrounding landscape? Further, in the "traffic light" assessment system it is hard to reconcile the impact on surrounding rural landscape being rated as Green with that for the Adjacent to Burial Ground site being rated as Red. What is it that justifies this difference?

Also (in para 116, p 47) the reference to the A34 should indicate it is in a **shallow** cutting in this **vicinity** and the noise levels are **not** reduced to an acceptable level; the predominant, prevailing wind from the SW carries noise from the more southerly, open section of the A34.

When added to the unsuppressed noise from the Barrow Road drying barns (occurring for around 5 months/year) is **very unacceptable!**

Further, (also para 116, p 47) it takes 5 minutes at brisk pace to walk along Abingdon Road from the corner of Barrow Road to the **former** Mace shop, without adding time to cross the road. Also it takes 8 minutes at similar pace to walk from the corner of Sutton Wick Lane and Abingdon Road. Even with good new path construction, it will take at least 10 minutes to walk from a central location on the Barrow Road site to that shop! Also it is a little difficult

to envisage a new, viable route of the proposed new footpath to the School that won't be longer than using Abingdon Road.

Para 113, p43 needs updating; it **was** known at the meeting on 18 October that the South Abingdon development had been approved! The Appeal was allowed on 11 July 2013.

COMMUNITY POLICY C-T8: ADDITIONAL BUS SERVICES (p 27) needs updating in the light of the recent improvements (Dec 2013) which give a half hourly service to Abingdon, Didcot and Oxford with hourly extensions to Wantage and Wallingford. Timing will continue to be dependent upon the wider traffic issues of Abingdon and the Oxford/Oxfordshire area rather than traffic in Drayton itself except when the village becomes gridlocked as a result of A34 blockage or closure.

We look forward to significant changes to the document which will result in us being able to support a modified version.

Tony & Pauline Croucher