

**Table 2: 1st DRAFT NDP Consultation - Comments Received on the first DRAFT Consultation Copy (Jan-Feb 2014)**

**Comments with Feedback**

REF NBR	RESPONDEE	TYPE	DATE	SUMMARY	SPECIFIC FEEDBACK	RESPONSE FROM DRAYTON2020
	NAME					
1	Daniel Scharf	Email	17.12.13	Copy of letter from Drayton resident to VWHDC Planning department		Document does not constitute formal response directed towards Drayton2020 regarding the pre-submission consultancy copy of the NDP. It is noted that elements of the letter pertinent to the NDP are contained in Mr Scharf's formal response to the NDP (see reference 24). No amendment to the NDP required.
2	English Heritage	Email	20.12.13	English Heritage response to SA Scoping Report (4 pages)		Comments to be taken on board when re-drafting SA
3	Natural England	Email	23.12.13	Natural England response to SA Scoping Report (3 paragraphs)		Comments to be taken on board when re-drafting SA
4	Ecological Land Cooperative	Email	05.01.13	Response from the Ecological Land Co-operative. Includes recommendation that a policy be included requiring developers to sell or let land and housing to be used in sustainable smallholding enterprises (3 pages)		Policy idea has previously been considered and discounted by Drayton2020. No amendment to the NDP required.

5	VWHDC Planning Dept.	Email	20.01.13	Copy of letter from VWHDC Planning Department to Drayton resident Daniel Scharf, responding to issues raised in his communication of 17th December (see reference 1). (3 pages)		Does not constitute a formal response to the pre-submission copy of the NDP. No amendment to the NDP required.
6	Sport England	Email	15.01.14	Generic response from Sport England with para. relating to VWHDC SPD (4 pages)	"It is important that the Neighbourhood Plan reflects national policy for sport as set out in the NPPF (particularly paragraphs 73 & 74), the contents of the district council's leisure and sports facilities strategy and the conclusions of a forthcoming updated playing pitch strategy"	Include reference to VWHDC leisure and sports facilities strategy in Policy P-WP5 Additional Recreational Facilities. Check Policy to ensure it complies with requirements of paras 73 & 74 of NPPF.
7	Marine Management Organisation	Email	15.01.14	Letter from Marine Management Organisation - no comments on NDP	"Thank you for inviting the Marine Management Organisation (MMO) to comment on the above consultation. I can confirm that the MMO has no comments on this document as the geographical area it covers does not include any area of the sea or tidal river and is therefore not within our remit."	No amendment necessary

8	Swindon Borough Council	Email	15.01.14	Letter from Swindon Borough Council - no comments on NDP, but requesting to be kept informed	"Thank you for consultation Swindon Borough Council on the Drayton Neighbourhood Plan 2020. We do not have any comments on the Neighbourhood Plan, but we would like to be kept informed on its progress"	No amendment necessary. Send email update regarding progress as required.
9	Oxford Playing Fields Association (OPFA)	Email	16.01.14	Email from Oxford Playing Fields Association. Offer to get involved with proposed new recreational facilities	"Thank you for the opportunity to comment on your neighbourhood plan. It is great to see that the parish has good plans in place for additional recreational facilities, a new play area and a skate park. OPFA would be very interested in getting involved in all of these projects, and helping the community to achieve them, so please do ask any steering groups to get in touch once they have been formed"	Offer of support to be acknowledged and taken up as required. No amendment to NDP considered necessary.
10	Highways Agency	Email	20.01.14	Email from Highways Agency - no comments on NDP	"We have reviewed the consultation and do not have any comments at this time"	No amendment necessary

11	Scottish Southern Electric	Email	20.01.14	Email, letter and associated document from SSE. Comment regarding capacity of existing infrastructure with regard to proposed development sites	"Please find attached below two letters, together with the attachments referred to, plus a copy of our mains records 'marked up' with each site in response to your message. One letter refers to our existing overhead plant/equipment that cross the proposed development areas, with the other letter giving some information in respect of providing the required future electricity supplies, both of which should be self explanatory"	Include reference to electricity supply infrastructure in Site Selection Process and Methodology section
12	Coal Authority	Email	24.01.14	Emailed letter from Coal Authority	"Having read through your documents, I confirm that we have no specific comments to make on the Neighbourhood Plan"	No amendment necessary
12A	Drayton Primary School (Head teacher/Governors)	Email	27.01.14	Detailed Response from Drayton Primary School. Comment on school places etc.		No action necessary as this is covered by OCC response regarding the provision of school places using s106 arrangements etc.
13	Tony Croucher (Resident)	Email	06.02.14	Comment regarding paragraph numbering, selection of Barrow Road site, and attendance at consultation events. (2 pages)		Paragraph numbering to be checked for consistency. Selection methodology employed to be described in more detail in next version. Update comments regarding attendance at public events.

14	Colin & Carol Arnold (Residents)	Email	10.02.14	Comment on selection and layout of Barrow Road site, attendance at consultation events, specific comment re C-T8, maintenance of green spaces, location of additional sports fields (2 pages)		Selection methodology employed to be described in more detail in next version; review wording of C-T8; include reference to maintenance of green spaces. Location of sports fields has previously been discussed by Drayton2020, having concluded that there was no real prospect of the land beside the existing sports field being made available, hence no amendment to the NDP required.
15	English Heritage	Email	11.02.14	Letter from English Heritage requesting more information on the conservation area and scheduled monuments detailed in the SA Scoping Report. Suggested including a listing of locally-important buildings & features. Also suggested conducting a characterisation study of the conservation area, and implementing a management plan. Recommended that County Archaeologist be consulted regarding Barrow Road site. Recommendation that Oxfordshire Historic Environment Record be consulted for all sites ( 3 pages)		Including recommendation that the PC undertake a characterisation study of and adopt a management plan for Drayton's conservation area, also consult Oxon Historic Environment Records for sites selected for possible development (separate community policy?). County archaeologist is involved in Barrow Road site - developer is in liaison with all relevant stakeholders - no amendment to NDP required.

16	Daniel Scharf (Resident)	Email	11.02.14	Email containing extensive comments on NDP Detailed analysis of the Draft NDP paragraph by paragraph from qualified planner. Offers to meet with Drayton2020 to discuss (27 pages)		<i>Response to feedback separately documented - see website</i>
17	South Oxfordshire District Council	Email	13.01.14	Letter from South Oxfordshire District Council. Observation: Figure 1 would benefit from some context, also that the purpose of the Plan be made explicit		Figure 1 considered adequate and to be left as-is. Section on Plan Purpose to be included.
18	Teresa Taylor (Resident)	Email	14.02.14	Email from resident. Concern regarding site map for South of High Street in that it purports to include land owned by a relative who reportedly has no intention of developing their land. Concerns expressed over number and positioning of buildings. Support for something to be done about the village hall.		Review site map for South of High Street to ensure correct land area is defined. Housing numbers have been discussed at length by Drayton2020 in liaison with various stakeholders - allocation driven to a large extent by VWHDC. Site selection methodology employed to be described in more detail in next version.

19	Natural England	Email	14.02.14	Letter from Natural England. Suggestion to use "biodiversity compensation" rather than "biodiversity offsetting" in title of P-WP8, also supporting text to include text on factors on measures to be adopted (example given). Comment that a number of sites were adjacent to public rights of way and that measures should be considered to protect and enhance their utility. Suggestion that bat and bird boxes should be incorporated into built fabric rather than attached to trees. Generic comments on whether plan has impact on protected species, also opportunities for enhancing the natural environment.		Title of W-WP8 to be amended to "biodiversity compensation". Supporting text to include measures to be adopted. Impact of development on protected species and opportunities to enhance natural environment to be referenced in appropriate policies. Amendment on policies on rights of way to include reference to new sites and additional provision. Suggestion regarding siting of bat and bird boxes to be taken on board; text to be amended accordingly.
20	Brian Eastoe (Resident)	Email	14.02.14	Email from resident agreeing with plan and thanking volunteers for their efforts	Brief email. "I agree with the proposed local plan and thank all those people who have spent so much, effort, money in putting it together. To all of you, well done."	No amendment to plan necessary
21	G.E.Stirling (Resident)	Letter	15.02.14	Hand-written note from resident. Strong opposition to the Barrow Road development. Statement that they wouldn't approve of the building plan.		Resident to be directed to Barrow Road residents group so that their concerns can be relayed to developer.

22	Rob Drury-Dryden (Resident)	Email	16.02.14	Email from residents. Supportive statement regarding the plan and proposed development at Manor Farm. Concerns that the NDP does not specify the number of houses being proposed, also that there appears to be little coordination with neighbouring parishes. Comment about how the NDP can be influenced by the community after its adoption	Short email. "Congratulations on a thorough well presented plan. I believe that the plans for the Manor farm site to develop this as a real village centre will be a huge asset and I hope that this can move ahead rapidly." Suggestion that housing numbers need to be made clear if the NDP is to be of value.	Indicative housing numbers to be identified in NDP. Review plan maintenance section.
23	Network Rail	Email	17.02.14	Email from Network Rail. Generic response - not relevant as there are no railway lines or associated infrastructure within the Parish		No amendment to plan necessary
24	Daniel Scharf (Resident) – 2nd & 3rd response	Email	16&19.02.14	Further emails from resident whose main submission was response reference 16 (7 pages)	Response with further information about food policies and sustainable development; 2 short emails about the South of High Street site.	<i>Response to feedback separately documented - see website</i>
25	Tony Croucher (Resident) – 2nd response	Email	19.02.14	Email from resident. Comment that the resident was aware of parishioners who were still unaware that the NDP was out for consultation		No amendment to plan necessary
26	Derek Pooley (Resident)	Email	19.02.14	Email from resident - supportive of plan.	Generally in favour of the draft plan, Would like to see a positive policy to extend rather than just maintain and enhance the footpath network. Particular recommendation for a permissive	No amendment to plan necessary



					path around the golf course.	
27	Oxfordshire County Council	Email	20.02.14 & 27.02.14	Response from Oxfordshire County Council (4 pages)	Comments on: contributions to infrastructure (schools; transport); transport strategy; specific housing sites; countryside; archaeology; waste and education	<i>Response to feedback separately documented - see website</i>
28	Jenny Pooley (Resident)	Email	20.02.14	Email from resident. Broad ranging comments and recommendations. (1 page email)	17 specific comments classified as a) Most important; b) Secondary importance; c) Frills	<i>Response to feedback separately documented - see website</i>
29	Neil & Julie Brown (Residents)	Email	20.02.14	Email from resident. Concerns regarding Barrow Road development and its impact on neighbouring properties. Suggestion of a larger development outside of the village. Little consideration of traffic impact.	Short email. "...We feel strongly that not enough consideration has been given to the existing residents regarding the positioning of the development. ...." (re Barrow Road site)	Resident to be directed to Barrow Road residents group so that their concerns can be relayed to developer. Sites outside of the village have been considered and discounted by Drayton 2020. Traffic impact to be considered and addressed in NDP.

30	Stuart Davenport & Dr Elizabeth Slack (Residents)	Email	20.02.14	<p>Email from residents. Concern regarding scale of developments proposed for village. Suggestion that some of the questions in questionnaire may have been leading, and that support for extensive development may be lacking. Comment on apparent emphasis on community centre, and that planning gain may be more usefully employed in elderly care provision and traffic mitigation. Comment about community pushing for front-loaded s106 agreements. Comment on proposed access to Barrow Road site - fear this would create a bottleneck. Suggestion that access be moved further north up the Abingdon Road.</p>	<p>Short email covering critique of the questionnaire methodology and suggestions about directing s106 resources. Objection to 'roundabout' at top of Sutton Wick. "...we do feel that the sheer degree of development that would occur should the 8 sites identified be developed would severely damage the identity and infrastructure of the village we are delighted to now call home...."</p>	<p>Scale of developments has been discussed at length and consulted on at length by Drayton 2020. Questionnaire's content was independently verified by ORCC prior to its circulation. Focus on community centre in response to parishioners' responses in questionnaire and at consultation events. Traffic mitigation measures will be considered and addressed in NDP. Elderly care is considered to be adequately addressed in NDP through various policies and measures. Resident to be directed to Barrow Road residents group so that their concerns can be relayed to developer.</p>
31	Ann Webb (Resident)	Email	20.02.14	<p>Email from resident. Concerns noted regarding capacity of sewerage system to cope with proposed new developments, also ability of local landfill sites to cope with waste from new residents. Concerns also noted regarding tankers visiting (sewerage) works, specifically that there are no passing places and the hours of operation.</p>		<p>Capacity of sewerage to be confirmed with Thames Water. Domestic waste disposal is the remit of VWHDC and (presumably) covered in their Local Plan.</p>

32	Michael & Rosie Steptoe (Residents)	Email	21.02.14	Email from residents. Opposed to the NDP on the basis that there is insufficient detail on the Barrow Road site (number and siting of dwellings, siting of sports pitches).	Short email. "...And we both would like to say we both disagree with the development plan, only because we feel there isn't enough detail in the plans with regards to (North of Barrow Road) i.e. number of houses and <i>their</i> location, the location of football pitches and cricket pitch. ...."	Resident to be directed to Barrow Road residents group so that their concerns can be relayed to developer.
33	Thames Valley Police	Email	21.02.14	Email from Thames Valley Police. Suggestion that all developments should incorporate the principles of "Secured by Design" (SBD) and, if possible, achieve SBD accreditation. Specific comments regarding NDP's alignment with VWHDC Local Plan policy DC3 and NPPF part 7 section 58 and part 8 section 69.	1 page email. "Thank you for consulting Thames Valley Police on the above and congratulations on a very well constructed document. In relation to crime prevention design I recommend that something along the following is included within the proposed policies; ...."	Review SBD to determine appropriateness for inclusion in NDP. VWHDC feedback to cover all aspects of their Local Plan. Confirm NDP aligns with respective NPPF sections (Section 7 para 58)

34	Marcham Parish Council	Email	21.01.14	Email from Marcham Parish Council. Comment that they felt to unable to comment on what Drayton wishes to achieve [through its NDP]. Offered congratulations on the work undertaken and wished success with the Plan.	Short email. "Marcham Parish Council discussed the neighbourhood plan at its recent meeting. Whilst Drayton adjoins Marcham parish the proposals do not directly affect the residential area of Marcham, so the Council was of the opinion that it could not really comment on what Drayton wishes to achieve. The Council would congratulate Drayton, and it is impressed by the amount of work that has gone into the document. It hopes that Drayton has success with the plan."	No action necessary
35	Sutton Courtenay Parish Council	Email	21.02.14	Email from Sutton Courtenay Parish Council. Concerns regarding the traffic implications should there be development along the Drayton Road [High Street in Drayton]. Comment that there could be a big impact on Sutton Courtenay, particularly at Culham Bridge.	Short email. " Sutton Courtenay Parish Council, in regards to housing site 3 in the Drayton Neighbourhood Plan, had great concerns regarding the traffic implications for Sutton Courtenay should there be development along the Drayton Road. It was thought that there was the potential for a big impact on Sutton Courtenay village, particularly the Culham bridge area which is already at a standstill at peak times. This was the only comment that Sutton Courtenay Parish Council wished to raise."	Make reference to concerns of neighbouring parishes in relation to traffic arising from development in section on Transport

36	Savills/Bloor Homes (South of High Street site developers)	Email	21.02.14	Letter from Savills (on behalf of Bloor homes, the developer considering the South of High Street Site). Broad ranging response.		<i>Response to feedback separately documented - see website</i>
37	DPDS Consulting for Earl of Plymouth Estates (Manor Farm site developers)	Email	21.02.14	Email from DPDS (developer considering the development of the Manor Farm site). Broad ranging response.		<i>Response to feedback separately documented - see website</i>
38	Dave Lee (Resident)	Email	21.02.14	Email from resident. Comment that it is unclear what Drayton wants i.e. no site preference is presented in Plan. Comment that document was well presented and that a lot of work had clearly gone into it.	Short email. "Having looked at this document, it is not clear to me what Drayton wants. The plan shows several sensible areas of build with advantages & disadvantages listed for each site but what is Drayton's preference? I know that there will a lot of external influence & Drayton may not end up with its ideal but surely a plan of what Drayton really really wants would be a good starting point in negotiations. Apart from that comment, the document is well presented & I applaud the people that were involved in its construction, clearly a lot of	Revised NDP to include a prioritisation of development sites.

					thought & work has gone into it.”	
39	Jayne C Castle (Resident)	Email	21.02.14	Email from resident. Comment that the best option for development was the Manor Farm site. Concern regarding the Barrow Road development, specifically regarding its distance from the village centre, and closing the distance to Abingdon. Comment regarding traffic impact of developments and that Plan would be the worst scenario for Drayton.	Short email. “ With regards to Drayton 2020 planning development. I have studied the proposed plans carefully and believe the best option is fig. 3 housing centred around the green. This would preserve the heart of the village. I feel quite strongly that to develop the field adjacent to Barrow road would be a string development to the village and even the sports fields would be at the furthest, inaccessible part of the village. This also brings the village nearer to becoming an annex of Abingdon. All developments in Drayton however produce a huge traffic problem and this particular proposal would be the worst scenario for Drayton.”	Resident to be directed to Barrow Road residents group so that their concerns can be relayed to developer. Traffic mitigation measures to be addressed in revised NDP.
40	Paul Holligan and four others (Residents)	Email	22.02.14	Letter signed by several residents. Concerns noted regarding Long Meadow site, specifically its access and impact on and screening from neighbours	Email with attached letter regarding proposed Long Meadow site making point that the site had an application from change of use from agricultural to residential which residents objected to and which was withdrawn. Three further points about the road access and screening of the site by the high	Long Meadow site is one of the least favoured sites hence unlikely to be developed in Plan period. Residents' concerns to be noted for the record.

					hedge.	
41	David Sattelle (Resident)	Email	24.02.14	Letter from resident. Broad ranging concerns noted regarding Barrow Road site. Specific concerns noted site selection methodology with regard to site's impact on traffic flows and neighbours, also access to village's amenities.	Email with attached letter regarding proposed Barrow Road site. 6 main points. In summary: (a) The authors of the colour-coded site assessment have seriously down played the severe impact of a site 1 housing development on traffic flows - this should be red not amber; (b) They have down played the impact on neighbours – all of whom will have an adverse impact on their existing aspect – this too should be red not amber; (c) The notion of easy access to amenities is also severely stretching a point. Mothers with buggies regularly face the obstacle course of cars parked on pavements and even on the bus stop between this site and the shops.	Site selection methodology to be more fully expanded in revised NDP. Resident to be directed to Barrow Road residents group so that their concerns can be relayed to developer.