We have studied the document at length and appreciate how much time and effort must have gone into its preparation. (I was however a little disappointed that although I receive e-mails about steering committee meetings and parish council meetings, I did not get one drawing my attention to this very important part of the process) We would like you to consider this as 2 sets of comments in any record of concerns raised to the document.

Yours Faithfully

Colin and Carol Arnold

DRAYTON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN 2014-2029 PRE-SUBMISISION Consultation Copy

A great deal of time and effort has obviously been put into the preparation of this plan. However at this time it is in need of some significant modifications before we could consider supporting it in the forthcoming Referendum. We will at this time, also do everything in our power to encourage others to reject it in its present form.

At the public meeting on the 18th October 2013 the Barrow Road Site was listed as number 2 with the Manor Farm site at number 1. We now see that this has been reversed suggesting that the Barrow Road site will be the first to be developed. When, Why and by Whom was this changed as we can find no record of any form of consultation having taken place. It gives the impression that as a village we do not want to develop the centre of the village, and would much rather extend the village to the North.

Also at the public meeting on 18th October a detailed layout for each site was displayed, this format has only been applied to the Manor Farm site in the document, it is imperative that all sites are represented in the same format, otherwise there is inadequate information available for us to be able to reach any sort of informed opinion.

In paragraph 115 (page 46) the comments regarding traffic flows seem to us to be ambiguous as the expansion of Milton Park and the Harwell Campus will mean that many of the new jobs will be south of Drayton so an increase in traffic through the village is inevitable. Furthermore the size and shape of the Barrow Road site would allow both NEW and EXISTING homes to over look the newly formed recreational space (much like an old fashioned Village Green). The stated walking times in the document appear to be based on someone with the fitness and speed of an Olympic athlete, certainly not on a normal walking pace or a mother with children and or a push chair. It is very evident that walking times have been thought about from the Barrow Road site, but there is no such information for any other sites especially the Manor Farm site. Which is much closer to all of the amenities which have been used as examples? With regard to the noise from the A34, there IS an issue, as the prevailing wind from the South West, carries the noise from the more southerly section of the road which is completely open, in addition to this the unsuppressed drone from the Barrow Road grain drying facility which goes on for approximately 5 months of every year makes the noise levels VERY UNACCEPTABLE!

How can it be that in paragraph 116 (page 47) it states that the views from the properties along the Abingdon Road and in Barrow Road will be affected, that it also states that there would be little impact on the surrounding landscape? In the foreword to the document it is stated that the consultation process included 3 well attended public meetings, even the highest stated attendance figure only represents around 11% of the adult population of Drayton, can

this really be considered as "well attended"? There is also the implication that concerns raised at public meetings were tested in the questionnaire which was distributed widely around the village, this suggests that the questionnaire was written and circulated after the 3rd meeting, in fact it was distributed after the 2nd meeting, so any concerns raised at the 3rd meeting could not possibly have been tested! So the concerns which were raised at the 3rd meeting, some of them very significant are totally ignored in the consultation copy, although they are mentioned but not identified in paragraph 16 (page 10) (Community Engagement)

Paragraph 113 (page 43) should be re-written as it was known at the meeting on the 18th October that the South Abingdon development had been approved. Community policy C-T8 (page 24) Additional Bus Services needs to be altered due to improvements made in December 2013, the punctuality of these services is and always will be dependant on the wider traffic issues within South Oxfordshire, except and as well as when the village is gridlocked due to any form of restriction on the A34.

We understand that the green spaces within the plan are very nice BUT how will they be maintained as we already have a Millennium Green that is really only kept in a state suitable for use as a dog exercise area. If the village hall was redeveloped to include a large and small hall on with the associated facilities on the ground floor and a proper sports pavilion on the first floor (as has been done else where) the additional sports pitches could be positioned on the site to the West of the Steventon Road, number 5 in figure 7 as this is adjacent to the existing pitches.

The addition of one new dwelling in the row of bungalows on the slip road to the West of the Abingdon Road at the Northern end of the village, caused considerable issues with Water Pressure, Electrical Surges and the operation of the main sewer, nowhere within the plan can we find any mention of how these services may be effected by the additional development that is proposed. This must be a major consideration, as it would have a knock on effect to every property in the village both old and new. Footpaths, Cycle Tracks, Tree planting etc. are all very nice, Water, Power and Drainage are essential!!

In conclusion we look forward to seeing major changes to the document, which after due consideration would allow us to support a modified version in the promised referendum.