

**Table 3 - 2nd DRAFT NDP Consultation - Comments Received on the second DRAFT Consultation Copy (June-July 2014)
Comments with Feedback**

REF NBR	RESPONDEE	TYPE	DATE	SUMMARY	SPECIFIC FEEDBACK
1	British Gas/Southern Gas Network	Email	16.06.14	British Gas do not own any gas mains, in this particular area the mains are owned by Southern Gas networks.	No Plan amendment necessary
2	Mark Oliver	Email	16.06.14	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.	Plan now corrected in revised NDP and community building (no longer planned here) removed. Clerk/Chairman D2020 replied immediately to Mark Oliver with this information. See further submission from Mark Oliver below

3	Marine Management Organisation	Email	16.06.14	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.	No Plan amendment necessary
4	Mark Oliver	Email	16.06.14	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 roundabout should be removed to give the maximum possible view of the new green (i.e. the green should start at the end of the Manor garden) Regards	No Plan amendment necessary. Site layout observations to be raised with developer.
5	Scottish Southern Electric	Email	17.06.14	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.	Section on electricity supply included in revised NDP
6	Natural England	Email	25.06.14	Many thanks for the above consultation. Natural England is a statutory consultee in neighbourhood planning and must be consulted on draft neighbourhood development plans by the Parish/Town Councils or Neighbourhood Forums where they consider our interests would be affected by the proposals made. We made an number of comments in our response to the earlier iteration of the plan (letter dated 14th February 2014). Following the changes to the plan, we have the following additional comments to make: We note that the South of High Street site abuts a public right of way. Development on this site should maintain as far as practicable the rural nature of these routes, and we advise the plan wording is amended accordingly. Similarly the North of Barrow Road abuts two public rights of way.	South of High Street site & Barrow Road info in revised NDP amended to include reference to ROW. Delivery of policies a matter for Parish Council, Funding strategy laid out in NDP Annex.

				Development on this site should maintain as far as practicable the rural nature of these routes, and we advise the plan wording is amended accordingly. 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 nature conservation sites or protected species or has other significant impacts on the natural environment then you should consult Natural England again.	
7	Exhibition Comments	Email	28.06.14	Written comments from the Exhibition to be taken into account (see Table 5 below)	See separate comments in Table 5 below
8	Colin Arnold	Email	02.07.14	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 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.	Included reference to improved disabled access to Parish's footpaths in revised NDP. Parking by MACE shop being dealt with by Parish Council – a police enforcement/OCC highways issue. Redesign of MACE corner and parking being considered along with potential Manor Farm development.
9	Daniel Scharf	Email	02.07.14	4 page submission commenting on the Exhibition – see Drayton2020 website	See specific responses posted on Drayton2020 Website against this

					submission
10	Clive & Kath Norkett	Email	03.07.14	<p>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</p>	Mainly site planning issues. Issue referred to Savills/Bloors for their attention and action

				private land. I trust you will consider our concerns and raise these with the Drayton 2020 committee and the developers.	
11	Daniel Scharf	Email	09.07.14	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 – see Drayton2020 website	See specific responses posted on Drayton2020 Website against this submission
12	Daniel Scharf	Email	10.07.14	[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.	Road names asked for at Exhibition to elicit possible names for Parish Council to consider when VWHDC ask for road names in future. Feedback given here and will be posted on website.
13	Marcham Parish Council	Email	13.07.14	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.	No amendment necessary
14	Sutton Courtenay Parish Council	Email	13.07.14	Sutton Courtenay Parish Council has now looked at the Neighbourhood Plan for Drayton again. 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.	Comments on traffic/speed limits noted. Traffic section in submission copy NDP heavily revised.

15	Paul & Julie Mayhew-Archer	Email	25.07.14	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. 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.	Comments on details of traffic calming and preference for footpath in south part of High Street over parking chicanes noted for future detail of traffic scheme. Comments on HGV routes echo concerns of Sutton Courtenay PC and OCC and are noted, but Drayton community favours HGV restrictions.
16	Highways Agency	Email	29.07.14	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.	No amendment necessary
17	English Heritage	Email	29.07.14	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 See Drayton2020 website	Clerk responded to English Heritage concerns and email exchanges also held with VWHDC about the Conservation Area– see further correspondence published on Drayton2020 website which concludes: "I am more than satisfied that this work, notwithstanding the lack of a Conservation Area Character Appraisal (subject to Sarah Oborn's confirmation

					of the acceptability of the allocation of the Manor Farm site in terms of its impact on the Conservation Area) provides an adequate evidence base for the Neighbourhood Plan.” (Martin Small, 14.08.14)
18	Blue Cedar Homes	Email	29.07.14	Drayton 2020 Neighbourhood Plan - Representations on behalf of Blue Cedar Homes Limited. Please find attached representations in respect of the above. We look forward to receiving confirmation of receipt of these representations in due course. Letter, 7 page attachment and photo/plan – see Drayton2020 website	Receipt issued by Clerk. Drayton PC/Clerk has replied to Blue Cedar and VWHDC have confirmed that this reply is in line with the response they would make given the advanced state of the Drayton NDP. In response to specific points made in submission See specific responses posted on Drayton2020 Website against this submission
19	Oxfordshire County Council	Email	30.07.14	3 page response & 3 annexes – see Drayton2020 Website	See Drayton2020 response on Drayton2020 website. Plan now includes contributions to infrastructure - s106 contributions listing, amended to include OCC requirements; transport section completely changed and expanded; specific site comments taken into account in site assessment; changes made to sections on Education, Countryside and Archaeology as appropriate
20	Rob Drury-Dryden	Email	30.07.14	Annotated copy of Consultation copy emailed – 12 specific comments. see Drayton2020 website	Suggested amendments reviewed and amendments made as appropriate. Traffic section completely revised.
21	Mark Tamburro	Email	30.07.14	I live at The Laurels, High Street, Drayton (old coal yard) and will be impacted by the Bloor Homes development to the South of the High Street. I moved into the village about 15	South of High Street site designated by VWHDC as a ‘strategic housing site’ by VWHDC. NDP must list this site for

			<p>years ago from Milton and have raised my family here (wife, 4 girls) and, being originally from Birmingham, thoroughly enjoy being part of the Drayton village community. Over the last few weeks/months I have been meeting with numerous neighbours and Bloor Homes to try to influence the design, look and feel of the proposed development and there is still much work to do. The quantity, positioning, screening, flooding measures and various other aspects need very careful attention and I am concerned that whatever we do this and the other developments will totally obliterate the ethos and look and feel of our village life. Whilst we recognise that we have to build more houses for the growing population I do think care and attention must be applied to where these are situated and we frankly feel that adding another 200+ dwellings into a small village like Drayton (with some 140 South of High Street) is utter madness and just not thought through properly. Beyond the developments detrimentally impacting the whole village life, ethos etc., it appears that little/no regard has been given to the <u>serious issue</u> of traffic. The current traffic situation is a complete farce at peak times and is getting worse by the day even in non peak times. The addition of over 200 dwellings in Drayton (not to mention the 160 designated for South Abingdon) will make an already critical situation totally unbearable. Surely someone understands this?? I therefore find it unbelievable that the latest report seeks to mitigate this problem by 'having 20 mph speed restrictions' throughout the village! Do any of you who sit on the Parish Council or are part of [Drayton] 2020 seriously believe that these measures will provide any respite to the many hundreds of people who have to get in and out of Abingdon on a daily basis whose daily commute is often in excess of 1 hour just to travel 3-4 mile. Indeed, how they would love to</p>	<p>development. Drayton2020 have reduced scale of housing to circa 135. Traffic issue now dealt with more fully in revised NDP. Traffic data provided, though not an independent survey (insufficient resources for a full traffic survey, but informal survey has been conducted by D2020 SG member).</p>
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>be able to travel at 20 mph and reach schools and places of work in a reasonable amount of time!! Adding almost 400 dwellings and therefore 800 cars (including South Abingdon) will make the already unbelievable commute an impossibility. I cannot for the life of me understand why no one seems to be taking this issue more seriously and why we cannot all agree to any developments ONLY IF THE ROAD INFRASTRUCTRE IS RESOLVED. Very frankly speaking, if you folks think it will be ok to add all these houses and cars and that calming measures will do the trick then you are living on cloud cuckoo land! Here's a real life example. I have two daughters who go to school in Abingdon. They don't get the bus anymore because it is always late because of the traffic and the pick up times are having to get earlier and earlier. Therefore, my wife has to drop them in and pick them up and even though she leaves the house by 7:45 am, it still takes her almost 1 hour to get into Abingdon. When I read the traffic measures that was proposed to alleviate this problem in your draft plan I though it was some sort of joke. I showed it to my wife and she wondered if the people that think this will fix an already critical and daily issue were of sound mind...This is not rocket science and I am amazed why someone isn't picking up the blinding obvious.. I therefore believe that we need to have an <u>independent traffic assessment</u> done to understand what the current state is and what the implications will be if these 4 developments and 350 dwellings come on line. I understand Bloor Homes commissioned one (it maybe only for their site) but, perhaps not surprisingly, we don't seem to have sight of this anywhere. Do you have a copy? If so, what does it conclude? That said, I would be concerned about relying solely on a report that was sponsored by the Developer... Secondly, we understand that the South Abingdon site has been rejected</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

				<p>because of the traffic issues. If this is the case then one would assume the same applies to the Drayton developments? Again, if you have a copy of the traffic reports associated with this we would like to see a copy. What is the Parish Council and Drayton 2020 response to this? Myself and most of my neighbours are on the same page with this. We recognise that some development has to happen (although we question the volume) but our main concern is that the traffic issues, both current and future, seem to be totally disregarded and the current process seems to be riding rough shod over our concerns and almost ignoring them completely.. Indeed, I feel so strongly about this, that if the developments are given the go ahead and that proper road infrastructure is not put in place (NOT TRAFFIC CALMING MEASURES) then we will put our house on the market and move as we simply will not be able to get in/out of school and work. Please take these response/s seriously. I would also ask that you share these comments with all the members of the Parish Council and Drayton 2020 committee. I also would be happy to come and discuss with any of you our concerns. I look forward to hearing from you in regard to the traffic survey undertaken by Bloors, the one behind the refusal for the South Abingdon site, and last but not least how we can get an independent survey done that takes into account all the surrounding proposed developments and clearly articulates the impact this will have on an already CRITICAL situation.</p>	
22	Tony & Pauline Croucher	Email	30.07.14	<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>See response to replacement submission below</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.</p> <p>2 page attachment – see Drayton2020 Website</p>	
23	Paul & Julie Mayhew-Archer	Email	31.07.14	<p>We are writing to express our concern about the traffic that will result from the Bloor Homes development South of the High Street. 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. We have written before to state our worries about the traffic calming measures being proposed (more "informal parking" for example). 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 (i.e. after this Friday). 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? 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>	Traffic issue now more fully addressed in revised NDP
24	Daniel Scharf	Email	31.07.14	<p>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 – see Drayton2020 Website</p>	See specific responses posted on Drayton2020 Website against this submission
25	Tony & Pauline Croucher	Email	31.07.14	<p>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. The</p>	See specific responses posted on Drayton2020 Website against this submission

				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	
26	Drayton Community School Governors	Email	31.07.14	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. 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). Also, is there in the plan any mention about increasing the amount of hard-standing (playground) and car park space (increased space?)	Amend Plan to include reference to traffic/parking at Pre-School
27	Colin & Carol Arnold	Email	31.07.14	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 – see Drayton2020 website	See specific responses posted on Drayton2020 Website against this submission
28	Antonia Seymour	Email	31.07.14	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	Traffic Section completely revised in NDP. Noise survey and issue also now included. Site assessment reviewed (see updated Sustainability Appraisal for details)

				<p>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 its assessment. 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>	
29	Savills/Bloor Homes	Email	01.08.14	<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 – see Drayton2020 website</p>	<p>See specific responses posted on Drayton2020 Website against this submission</p>
30	Dave Lee	Email	01.08.14	<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>	<p>No amendment necessary</p>
31	Thames Water (via Savills)	Email	01.08.14	<p>3 page attachment – see Drayton2020 website</p>	<p>New major issue on lack of sewage capacity noted and section added to NDP. Paragraph added to each of three sites</p>
32	Environment Agency	Email	01.08.14	<p>Thank you for consulting the Environment Agency on the</p>	<p>No Plan amendment necessary</p>

				revised Pre-submission Drayton 2014-2031 Neighbourhood Plan. We have reviewed the Neighbourhood Plan and we have no comments to make. If you have any further questions please don't hesitate to contact me.	
33	VWHDC	Email	01.08.14	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) – see Drayton2020 website	All suggestions reviewed. Most included in changes to Submission NDP, revised Design Guide and Sustainability Appraisal, as appropriate
34	Chris Bone	Email	01.08.14	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.	Traffic now more fully addressed in amended NDP