

| Date     | Name                           | Contact Details | Nature of Response | Comments   |
|----------|--------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------|--|
| 16.06.14 | British Gas                    | Leon Millard    |                    | British Gas do not own any gas mains, in this particular area the mains are owned by Southern Gas networks.  |
| 16.06.14 | Mark Oliver                    |                 |                    | Thank you for forwarding on the latest 2020 neighbourhood plan document.   |
|          |                                |                 |                    | I live at The Granary, the green in Drayton and I am very concerned at the location shown for a village hall on page 19. This is showing a very very large hall building (the size of which I am very surprised  |
|          |                                |                 |                    | at) only a few metres from my boundary. I am not against any development to this site, in fact I purchased this property in 2005 knowing fully the planned housing on the site and felt that this was correct scale for the conservation area and the many listed buildings of manor farm 'complex' (of which The Granary is in fact treated as one as it is within the curtilage of a listed building).   |
|          |                                |                 |                    | I have had to obtain listed building consent for any alterations to The Granary and welcome this to preserve such conservation areas. The location shown (possibly provisional but nevertheless) in my opinion is not acceptable in terms of mass and scaling within the conservation area and does not uphold the original character of the manor farm complex. I would be totally against this size of building in this location and would welcome anyone to come into my property to view the site area from my house and then decide if it is fitting or not ! As an architectural designer myself I can perhaps see what is planned more than others without access to my property. |
|          |                                |                 |                    | With 2 very young children I am up able to attend meetings but would welcome a response on this.   |
| 16.06.14 | Marine Management Organisation |                 |                    | Thank you for inviting the Marine Management Organisation (MMO) to comment on the above consultation. I can confirm that the MMO has no comments to submit in relation to this consultation.   |
| 16.06.14 | Mark Oliver                    |                 |                    | Thank you replying so quickly and enclosing the updated plan.  |
|          |                                |                 |                    | It looks a slightly 'strange layout' but I will see if I can get along on the dates listed to have more of a look.   |
|          |                                |                 |                    | I don't like the large gardens for some and then cram the others in, but that's my opinion.  |
|          |                                |                 |                    | I agree about the Abingdon road entrance - surely the houses to the south of the the roundabout should be removed to give the maximum possible view of the new green (ie the green should start at the end of the Manor garden) Regards  |
| 17.06.14 | Scottish Southern Electric     | Chris Gaskell   |                    | I refer to your message and attachment below regarding the above topic.  |
|          |                                |                 |                    | Thank you for giving me the opportunity of making any further comments, which I can confirm there are none over and above those already made in my two letters to you dated 20 January 2014.   |

|          |                      |               |  |  |
|----------|----------------------|---------------|--|--|
|          |                      |               |  | For your information and assistance, I have proved these letters below, together with the referred to attachments.   |
| 25.06.14 | Natural England      | Charles Routh |  | Many thanks for the above consultation. Natural England is a statutory consultee in  |
|          |                      |               |  | We made an number of comments in our response to the earlier iteration of the plan (letter   |
|          |                      |               |  | We note that the South of High Street site abuts a public right of way. Development on this  |
|          |                      |               |  | Similarly the North of Barrow Road abuts two public rights of way. Development on this site  |
|          |                      |               |  | We welcome the section on Enhancing the Parish's Natural Environment and Biodiversity, although greater clarity around how these policies will be delivered would be welcome.  |
|          |                      |               |  | If, as you develop your plan, you consider that it will significantly impact on designated   |
|          |                      |               |  | For any correspondence or queries relating to this consultation only, please contact me on   |
|          |                      |               |  | We really value your feedback to help us improve the service we offer. We have attached a feedback form to this letter and welcome any comments you might have about our service.  |
| 28.06.14 | Exhibition Comments  |               |  | Written comments from the Exhibition to be taken into account  |
|          |                      |               |  | My concerns about disabled access were more to do with footpaths, in particular the fact that it is not possible to gain access to the millennium green from Henleys Lane or Church Lane. I have only discovered this since I have been in a position to use a mobility scooter since having a hip replacement recently. As we live in an aging community the use of these scooters will be a major part of life and as such I think that we should have this in mind as we design footpaths and other public routes around the village. As for buildings there are strict rules regarding disabled access which should be dealt with by the owners or operators, and therefore do not need to be to much of a concern to the 2020 plan. Young families could also encounter similar issues with pushchairs. As I pointed out in my original email the footpaths from Henleys lane heading North are very often restricted by parked vehicle's and the one on the Eastern side of the road has some very nasty cambers that can also force scooter users on to the road and into the path of oncoming traffic. |
| 02.07.14 | Colin Arnold         |               |  |  |
| 02.07.14 | Daniel Scharf        |               |  | 4 page submission commenting on the Exhibition   |
| 03.07.14 | Clive & Kath Norkett |               |  | Following the Drayton 2020 exhibition we attended on 27th June, with regard to the above proposed development, we would like to register our concerns.   |
|          |                      |               |  | We reside at Barford House, which is immediately adjacent to the proposed building site, south of the High Street.   |
|          |                      |               |  | Our primary concerns with the new proposals are the proximity of the new dwellings (circa 33 metres) and the potential loss of the natural screening provided by the woodland immediately adjacent to our property.  |

|          |                        |  |  |   |
|----------|------------------------|--|--|---|
|          |                        |  |  | When we purchased the property, we did so due to the quiet and secure position which was not overlooked by any other properties. The house is in a private road and benefits considerably from significant privacy and natural screening, which we would wish to be maintained.   |
|          |                        |  |  | We would appreciate it if the position of the new dwellings could be reassessed as we understand that the initial plans did not include development on this part of the site.   |
|          |                        |  |  | We would also like consideration to be given to keeping the current screen of trees to provide a natural barrier. We accept that this area may not have significant ecological benefits, but it does not only maintain our privacy and security but also provides a haven for birds, deer and other wildlife which is generally lacking in the village.   |
|          |                        |  |  | We would also like to point out that the area of woodland is subject to prolonged flooding and we would like assurance that defences be put into place to ensure that the additional development does not adversely affect our property with the reduced natural drainage and increased hard landscaping.   |
|          |                        |  |  | Finally, we were extremely concerned and distressed to note that a photograph had been taken of the front of our property and used in the advertising regarding the development. Not only was this without our permission, but also the fact that the photographer was trespassing on private land.   |
|          |                        |  |  | I trust you will consider our concerns and raise these with the Drayton 2020 committee and the developers.  |
| 09.07.14 | Daniel Scharf          |  |  | I attach some notes on the current draft that would be happy to discuss with those responsible for submitting the next version to the VWHDC. 12 page submission attached  |
| 10.07.14 | Daniel Scharf          |  |  | [Apologies for Steering Group Meeting]. My only contributions would have been 1. to raise the question of whether it was appropriate to ask for suggestions of road names of developments that are not yet in any plan (and might not be), and 2. to request a schedule of responses to representations so that people know why their comments have or have not been taken into account. This is good practice in plan making (part of receiving a fair hearing and knowing whether or how to pursue a matter as the plan |
|          |                        |  |  | proceeds) and is a concern that has been passed on to me from others who have engaged with the plan.  |
| 13.07.14 | Marcham Parish Council |  |  | Marcham Parish Council recently re-considered the Drayton Neighbourhood Plan. The actual proposals are obviously for the parish of Drayton to agree, but this Council would congratulate Drayton in its persistence in the face of moving targets. Marcham Parish Council wishes you luck with its implementation, and watches eagerly with a possible view to copying your efforts in the future.  |

|          |                                   |  |  |  |
|----------|-----------------------------------|--|--|--|
|          |                                   |  |  | Sutton Courtenay Parish Council has now looked at the Neighbourhood Plan for Drayton again.  |
| 13.07.14 | Sutton Courtenay Parish Council   |  |  | It's only comments were on the Transport policies, particularly T1 and T5.   |
|          |                                   |  |  | Whilst they are probably laudable in isolation, the Parish Council was of the opinion that they could impact on Sutton Courtenay and other parishes adjacent to Drayton.   |
|          |                                   |  |  | A 20 mph limit could well encourage drivers not to go through Drayton, and they will be looking for alternate routes. As a result this would impact on the adjacent villages.  |
|          |                                   |  |  | A 7.5 tonne limit in the High Street seems impossible as this road is the B4016.. A weight restriction would totally block this as is a through route for vehicles above this weight, again causing them to put extra pressure on other residential areas.   |
| 25.07.14 | Paul & Julie Mayhew-Archer        |  |  | We wish to express our concern regarding the measures for controlling traffic flow along the High St following the building of the new development.  |
|          |                                   |  |  | In particular we are worried by the idea of controlling traffic through "encouraging informal parking". On the plans we viewed this informal parking seemed to be encouraged either side of Chiers Drive. Anyone who has driven out of Chiers Drive will know that visibility is poor and the presence of parked vehicles to the right of Chiers Drive as one exits will only make it harder to see traffic and be seen by traffic. We spoke to the young man representing the traffic experts and he told us no-one from the traffic consultants had actually driven out of Chiers Drive. |
|          |                                   |  |  | On thing that has been brought to our attention is that there used to be a cobbled pavement running along the south side of the High Street. Reinstating this pavement would narrow the road, encourage people to drive more slowly but not lead to worse visibility.  |
| 29.07.14 | Highways Agency - Stephen Yandall |  |  | Thank you for your email dated 16 June 2014 inviting the Highways Agency (HA) to comment on the Drayton 2020 Neighbourhood Plan.   |
|          |                                   |  |  | The HA is an executive agency of the Department for Transport (DfT). We are responsible for operating, maintaining and improving England's strategic road network (SRN) on behalf of the Secretary of State for Transport.   |
|          |                                   |  |  | The HA will be concerned with proposals that have the potential to impact the safe and efficient operation of the SRN.   |
|          |                                   |  |  | We have reviewed the consultation and do not have any comment at this time.  |
| 29.07.14 | English Heritage - Martin Small   |  |  | Thank you for your e-mail of 16th June advising English Heritage of the consultation on your Revised Neighbourhood Plan. Please find attached our comments (please note, these are being sent by e-mail only). 4 page response   |

|          |  |  |  |   |
|----------|--|--|--|---|
| 29.07.14 | Blue Cedar Homes Ltd - Des Dunlop          |  |  | <p>Drayton 2020 Neighbourhood Plan - Representations on behalf of Blue Cedar Homes Limited. Please find attached representations in respect of the above.</p> <p>We look forward to receiving confirmation of receipt of these representations in due course.</p> <p>Letter, 7 page attachment and photo/plan</p>   |
| 30.07.14 | Oxfordshire County Council - Amanda Jacobs |  |  | 3 page response & 3 annexes   |
| 30.07.14 | Rob Drury-Dryden                           |  |  | Annotated copy of Consultation copy emailed   |
| 30.07.14 | Mark Tamburro                              |  |  |   |
| 30.07.14 | Tony & Pauline Croucher                    |  |  | <p>We attach our comments and observations on the above Consultation Document and ask that they are submitted in full to the 2020 Steering Group.</p> <p>Having had no feedback regarding 2 of the 3 submissions we were associated with regarding the earlier Consultation Document, would you please advise us when you expect the Steering Group to respond to communications received in this part of the Consultation process. 2 page attachment</p>   |
| 31.07.14 | Paul & Julie Mayhew-Archer                 |  |  | <p>We are writing to express our concern about the traffic that will result from the Bloor Homes development South of the High Street.</p> <p>We live at Chiers house off the High St so will be affected by the considerably increased volume of traffic, whichever direction it is going in.</p> <p>We have written before to state our worries about the traffic calming measures being proposed (more "informal parking" for example)</p> <p>We now discover from another resident along the High Street, Rob Dryden Jones, that a traffic survey has been carried out but that the results will not be made known until after the neighbourhood plan consultation period is closed (ie after this Friday)</p> <p>It seems odd that we are asked for our views when not in possession of a key report which we know exists but is not made available to us. After all, the volume of traffic is as important to many residents as the number of houses. Has Drayton 2020 seen it? Is it entirely independent? Who paid for it?</p> <p>Anyway, if Rob is right in what he says then we simply want to register, in advance of the report, our extreme concern about potential traffic along the high street.</p> |
| 31.07.14 | Daniel Scharf                              |  |  | Some additional comments on phasing, food and low carbon transport that I hope will be helpful in preparing a plan for the next 15 years. 3 page attachment   |
| 31.07.14 | Paul Mayhew-Archer                         |  |  | I am not sure if this is strictly a comment on the neighbourhood plan but I will make it anyway.  |

|          |   |  |  |  |
|----------|---|--|--|--|
|          |   |  |  | At the last Drayton 2020 meeting I attended there was an unresolved disagreement between Richard Webber and Daniel Scharf regarding the Drayton developments and the Taylor Wimpey development south of Abingdon. Daniel was convinced Taylor Wimpey would issue an injunction against any of the proposed Drayton sites (on the grounds that they fall under the same County Council traffic restrictions currently stopping Taylor Wimpey. Richard was equally certain they wouldn't.  |
|          |   |  |  | Clearly, uncertainly over this is a problem.   |
|          |   |  |  | What happens if Taylor Wimpey do not themselves get permission to build? (apparently they have re-applied for permission). Since they have spent millions on the land it seems inconceivable they won't issue an injunction against other nearby developments that would make their own chances of building even less possible. If they do issue an injunction presumably that will throw our neighbourhood plan (and indeed the DC local plan) into jeopardy since both are up against time in any case. If there is no local plan then again we become subject to more speculative proposals. (Blue Cedar for example) |
|          |   |  |  | And if Taylor Wimpey do get permission now to build 159 houses between Drayton and Abingdon are we really suggesting Drayton should also take another 200 houses. That's 360 homes potentially adding to the Drayton road congestion. That I think would be madness and what concerns us is that there is so much rush to get the local plan in before pre-election purdah begins we may do something irreversible and highly damaging to our sustainability.  |
|          |   |  |  | Does the Parish Council and Drayton 2020 have plans in place to cater for all these possibilities of permissions and injunctions? Is Daniel a lone voice? Might he be right? I left the meeting thinking the whole situation could turn into an uncertain mess.  |
| 31.07.14 | Tony & Pauline Croucher                             |  |  | Further to my email yesterday, I attach for your attention an amended copy of my comments and observations in response to the formal Consultation process process.   |
|          |   |  |  | The amendment arises solely in respect of Item 6; I realised I had incorrectly confused Abingdon Road residents and Barrow Road residents when referring to the latter named site.   |
|          |   |  |  | I apologise for any inconvenience caused. 2 page (revised) attachment  |
| 31.07.14 | Drayton Community School<br>Governors - Pat Athawes |  |  | The current pre school building is woefully inadequate ; it does not have even the most basic requirements - child-sized loos, an area to eat, storage etc, etc. It is basically one room.   |

|          |                      |  |  |  |
|----------|----------------------|--|--|--|
|          |                      |  |  | <p>If there is a decision to keep the pre school on its current site, it will need expansion and total refurbishment. Also, increased traffic into the school area will need careful consideration; dropping-off times are already very, very difficult, so with potentially 50+ new children and associated parents what considerations have been made to keep the area peaceful (no trouble with the neighbours).</p>  |
|          |                      |  |  | <p>Also, is there in the plan any mention about increasing the amount of hard-standing(playground) and car park space (increased space?)</p>   |
| 31.07.14 | Colin & Carol Arnold |  |  | <p>Please find attached our comments on the revised NDP. However so little has changed that all comments relating to the first version are probably still valid. 2 page attachment</p>   |
| 31.07.14 | Antonia Seymour      |  |  | <p>All those involved in the preparation of the NDP are to be applauded for their efforts to date. I'd like to make a few brief comments on the presubmission consultation copy dated 16th June 2014.</p>  |
|          |                      |  |  | <p>As householders most directly impacted by the planned development of the land South of the High Street, my husband and I have already put our house on the market knowing that our much enjoyed rural outlook is under threat. The deciding factor for us to move was not just the loss of our view, but the prospect of an even worse traffic situation than there is now. I realize this is an issue that has been raised over and over again, but the NDP still seems to be missing the point. This is about traffic in and out of Abingdon more than it is about traffic in the village itself. The current traffic situation getting into Abingdon is already intolerable, so the prospect of adding some 800 cars (assuming 400 houses including South Abingdon should Taylor Wimpey win their appeal) seems impossible to comprehend. My children go to school in Abingdon and what should be a 10 minute journey for my husband, can take up to an hour. Likewise my commute to Oxford involves me leaving at 7.15 am to avoid sitting in a huge tailback on the Drayton Road to access the A34 North. Traffic assessments undertaken in Drayton are totally missing the point. The traffic in the village itself isn't that bad (though certainly not great) but it's the bottle neck into Abingdon that causes Drayton residents such immense frustration. An independent traffic assessment should be undertaken at the entry point into Abingdon with surveying done at rush hour and on the weekends (when Tesco traffic results in similar tailbacks) and that takes into account total expected additional traffic from the combined housing developments across the area.</p> |

|          |  |  |  |   |
|----------|--|--|--|---|
|          |  |  |  | <p>Additionally I'd like to question the thinking that was done to rule out other possible housing sites in the Drayton Parish. In particular those to the Northwest, Southwest and West of the village. I'd like to understand please what evidence has been gathered to inform the Drayton 2020 decision that none of the sites DRAY 03/12, DRAY 04, DRAY 05 and DRAY 06 are suitable for housing. Were the majority of villagers themselves of the same opinion? Wording in the NDP and appendices talks of a "belief" in the sites being unsuitable due to noise levels. But that's a subjective view. What evidence has been gathered that has stopped any further consideration of these sites? You only have to travel down the A34 to Chilton to see large scale development alongside the A34 (including executive homes). I'd argue that these sites should not be ruled out without fuller investigation. The fact that you reference the NPPF seemingly abandoning the notion of advisory maximum noise levels suggests that noise levels aren't given the same substantive weighting as perhaps Drayton 2020 has chosen to apply in it's assessment.</p> |
|          |  |  |  | <p>I look forward to hearing from you/Drayton 2020 on the traffic survey possibility and with further background to the decision that noise constraints trump all other constraints leading to the exclusion of any sites bordering the A34 from the list of suitable sites in the NDP.</p>   |
| 01.08.14 | Savills/Bloor Homes                    |  |  | <p>Please find attached a response to the consultation on the Pre-Submission Drayton Neighbourhood Development Plan, submitted by Savills on behalf of Bloor Homes. A hard copy will follow. 4 page attachment</p>  |
|          |  |  |  | <p>I would be grateful for acknowledgement of receipt of the consultation response in due course.</p>   |
| 01.08.14 | Dave Lee                               |  |  | <p>I made a comment on the earlier plan that it showed various options without (to my mind), stating clearly what Drayton wants. This latest version addresses that. The Drayton 2020 organisation has clearly done an enormous amount of work to come up with a sensible plan that reflects the requirements of many. I am sure that it is not ideal for some but it seems to be a very good compromise. It is a plan that states clearly what is right for Drayton. Let us hope that it can withstand any pressure from external agencies that might try to impose changes that are not right for Drayton.</p>  |
| 01.08.14 | Thames Water - Savills (Carmelle Bell) |  |  | <p>3 page attachment</p>  |
| 01.08.14 | Environment Agency - Ashley Maltman    |  |  | <p>Thank you for consulting the Environment Agency on the revised Pre-submission Drayton 2014-2031 Neighbourhood Plan.</p>  |
|          |  |  |  | <p>We have reviewed the Neighbourhood Plan and we have no comments to make.</p>   |
|          |  |  |  | <p>If you have any further questions please don't hesitate to contact me.</p>   |



|          |                          |  |  |   |
|----------|--------------------------|--|--|---|
| 01.08.14 | VWHDC - Katherine Pearce |  |  | Please find attached comments from Vale officers. This has not been signed off by managers or councillors but is hoped it will be helpful in finalising the plan and associated documents. (8 page attachment)  |
| 01.08.14 | Chris Bone               |  |  | I understand that there is an expectation from the Vale that Drayton should accept its fair share of new houses however, surely the already heavily congested traffic situation in the village should be taken into account when determining the number of houses planned.  |
|          |                          |  |  | The traffic on the High Street and Abingdon Road during rush hour already turns a 5 minute journey into Abingdon into an hour's marathon, I dread to think what impact another 200 houses will make.  |
|          |                          |  |  | Whilst I applaud the huge amount of work undertaken by Drayton 2020 over the past couple of years in wanting to improve the village environment and its facilities I do think we've lost sight of the impact that a significant number of new houses will make to traffic congestion. If the Vale are going to insist on 200 houses for Drayton then I think Drayton 2020/Parish Council should push with by saying ok but in return we want a significantly improved road network. |
|          |                          |  |  | The proposed traffic calming measures presented at the recent exhibition are in no way going to mitigate the impact of 200 new homes and anyone believing the contrary is in my opinion not facing up to reality.   |