

WESTON-ON-THE-GREEN NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

2018 – 2031



CONSULTATION STATEMENT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	3
<i>Engagement with hard to reach groups</i>	4
<i>Key responses from consultation</i>	4
<i>Regulation 14 pre-submission consultation</i>	4
Appendix A	5
<i>THE STEERING GROUP, Village Meetings, CONSULTATION STAGES</i>	5
Village Meetings	8
<i>Event One October 17th, 22nd 2015</i>	8
<i>Event Two February 6th 10th 2016</i>	12
<i>Event Three September 20th 2016</i>	13
<i>Booklets and books written about the village</i>	15
Appendix B: Steering Group Meetings 2015-18	16
Appendix C: Meetings with Landowners	23
Appendix D: Letter to non-statutory consultees on pre-submission consultation and list of businesses and respondents	24
Appendix E Comments, response and action to non-statutory consultees.....	28
Appendix F: Letter to statutory consultees on pre-submission consultation	46
Appendix G Statutory consultees for Pre-Submission Consultation (May-July 2017)	47
<i>Schedule of Comments from Statutory Consultees</i>	51
Appendix H: Meetings with Cherwell District Council.....	76
Appendix I Consultation over amendment to draft Neighbourhood Plan regarding the Schoolfield..	79

INTRODUCTION

This Consultation Statement has been prepared to fulfil the legal obligations of the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations 2012 in respect of the Weston-on-the-Green Neighbourhood Plan.

The legal basis of this Consultation Statement is provided by Regulation 15(2) of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended), which requires that a consultation statement should:

- contain details of the persons and bodies who were consulted about the proposed neighbourhood development plan;
- explain how they were consulted;
- summarise the main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted; and
- describe how these issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant addressed in the proposed neighbourhood development plan.

The policies contained in the Plan are as a result of considerable interaction and consultation with the community and businesses within the parish. Work has involved continuous consultation with the community over approximately two and one half years, including surveys, public meetings and events. This has been overseen and coordinated by the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group that was formed to oversee the work of the respective Working Groups. Views and interactions from this process from this evidence base led to the Objectives and Policies in Section 5 of the Plan.



Organisational structure of the Plan

The organisation of the Plan is described in Sections 1.2 and 1.6 of the Plan and the preparatory process is also summarised in Section 1.6, including the calendar of public events and the milestones for the Plan preparations. Information on the public consultations is also provided in Appendix B (Statement of community engagement and consultation) and Appendix E (Community survey data) in the Neighbourhood Plan document.

The formation of the Plan has been characterised by extensive community involvement and engagement. The Steering Group collected information from the community in order to develop policies that will deliver good design and appropriate housing for the needs of the village. (*Appendix A: Village Meetings, Steering Group, Village Meetings and Consultation Stages.*)

The Steering Group comprised members from the Parish Council and from the village community and met regularly throughout the period November 2014 to June 2017. Steering Group meeting notes and actions were published on the Plan website at www.wotgneighbourhoodplan.co.uk/meeting-notes. (*Appendix B:*

Steering Group Meetings 2015-2017). Intensive editing and consultation with the Schoolfield Action Group and through village meetings over the second policy on land use continue until March 2018 with advice and agreement from the qualifying body, the Parish Council.

Individual consultations between the Steering Group members and landowners, developers or agents were also held in order to identify and manage expectations for development within the Plan. Information from these consultations was reported back to the full Steering Group and contributed to the final Plan policies and designated sites (Section 5 of the Plan and Appendices F, G, and H). (*Appendix C of Consultation Paper: Meetings with landowners,*)

ENGAGEMENT WITH HARD TO REACH GROUPS

Throughout the process of engagement with the community – particularly in analysing the demographic make-up of respondents to the Community Survey – it was highlighted that there were certain groups within the community that were not engaging as fully as would be wished in order to have a fully representative plan. In particular, many of the elderly residents of the village are not conversant with online information and are in many cases not able to attend public events in the village hall, nor return completed surveys to the drop box in the Village shop or Church. For this reason, members of the Steering Group and volunteers visited a significant number of residents at their homes to gather information from them and to collect their responses to surveys. There were also two street meetings to discuss issues of specific concern. Other members of working groups visited business premises outside the village in person to collect responses and provide an opportunity to discuss the purpose of the Plan and its relevance to business. In terms of houses outside of the village envelope (occasionally referred to as Upper Weston and outlying houses), our communications team was diligent in making sure the flyers and any other information was hand delivered.

KEY RESPONSES FROM CONSULTATION

The community survey had a response rate of 35.3% and the detailed responses to each question are shown in Appendix E of the Neighbourhood Plan document. Survey questions addressed ideas on Community and Economy; Housing; Environment and Public Spaces; Traffic Calming and Movement; Design. These ideas were presented and the subject of further discussion at the Village Event on 17th & 22nd October 2015.

REGULATION 14 PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION

The Steering Group finalised the draft Plan in April 2017 and the Regulation 14 pre-submission consultation was launched on April 13th 2017 for the required six-week period to 25th May 2017. The actions to achieve the consultation were:

- a newsletter was delivered to every household and business premises in the parish, including homes outside of the village envelope, to alert everyone of the consultation and the means by which they could participate;
- hard copies of the full Neighbourhood Plan with Appendices were made available to all members of the Steering group, members of the Parish Council and some retained for consultation at the Village Hall and Church;
- digital copies of the Plan and additional documents were available to read and download from

www.wotgneighbourhoodplan.co.uk and a direct link to this url was provided from the Weston-on-the-Green Parish website at <http://www.westononthegreen-pc.gov.uk/>;

- Notices were displayed on the Village noticeboard and various sites around the village.

In accordance with Regulation 14, letter/email parties notified relevant statutory consultees with particular interest in the Plan.

A copy of the letter sent and the full list of non- statutory consultees are provided in Appendix D.

A copy of the letter sent and the full list of statutory consultees are provided in Appendix F.

The schedule of comments and responses to the pre-submission consultations are provided in Appendices E and G respectively

APPENDIX A

THE STEERING GROUP, VILLAGE MEETINGS, CONSULTATION STAGES

Steering Group Members	
Diane Bohm (Chair)	Susan Davis
Roger Evans (Vice-Chair)*	Bob Hessian
Eric Bohm (Treasurer)	Alex Reid***
Guy Holland**	Yasemin Olcay
Norman Machin	Mike Finbow (Nov 2015)
*Resigned November 2015 **Resigned August 2016	***Resigned August 2017
Village Form and Character Team Guy Holland (Team Leader) Resigned Nov 2015 Norman Machin Roger Evans (Chair 2015/16) Paul Beecroft	John Roper Yasemin Olcay Paula Hessian Henry Donne Patsy Parsons

<p>Social & Economic Aspects Team</p> <p>Susan Davis (Team Leader) Bob Hessian Anne Brown Carolyn Bushby</p>	<p>Diane Bohm John Roper Paula Hessian Henry Donne Patsy Parsons</p>
--	--

<p>Transportation & Highways Team</p> <p>Bob Hessian (Team Leader) Eric Bohm Graham Barnett</p>	<p>Louise Talbot Neil Mullane</p>
--	--

<p>Community Engagement Team</p> <p>Alex Reid (Team Leader) Bob Hessian Diane Bohm John Roper Yasemin Olcay</p>	<p>Patsy Parsons Robin Stafford Allen Louise Talbot Mike Finbow</p>
--	--

4 – Volunteers Code of Conduct

1. Transparency: open meetings, disclosure of interests.
2. Respect: No actions or personal criticism, we are all here doing this on a voluntary basis and everyone deserves respect for that.
3. Commitment: It will take a large number of us to share the work. Anyone taking on a task, no matter how small, will need to do it on time because everyone else will be depending on it.
4. Efficiency: we should respect the time given by volunteers by running an efficient planning process and holding effective meetings.
5. Fun: this should be a fulfilling and enjoyable exercise. We have an opportunity to plan the future of our village, so let's enjoy it.



5 – Meeting Protocol

The progress of the Neighbourhood Plan is meant to be iterative. Hence too many formal rules could close down useful discussion. For the purpose of open and considerate discussion, the following Meeting Protocol is proposed:

1. The Chair will set an Agenda that will include items requested by the Steering Group and/or by villagers;
2. Meetings are open to members of the public who will sign in with an option to include their email account. They will then be added to the circulation list for all Minutes/Action Lists;
3. When rising to speak, members of the public are requested to identify themselves and their association with the village;
4. Members of the public will be invited to raise questions after each agenda item. If the query requires in-depth and lengthy discussion, it will be referred to the appropriate sub-committee for fuller discussion and analysis. The item will be added to the agenda of the next meeting;
5. The Chair reserves the right to close discussion on a given topic after an appropriate time;
6. Members of the Steering Group and the general public will be expected to follow this Code of Conduct.

6 – Declaration of Interest

Name (please print)	
Address	
Declaration of Interest pertaining to financial benefit from the Neighbourhood Plan e.g. landowner, contractor, developer, other beneficiary of financial gain, representative of a beneficial owner of land/property.	
Signature	Date

Signed by Steering Group and members of sub-groups.

**all of these documents are filed in our archive.

VILLAGE MEETINGS

EVENT ONE OCTOBER 17TH, 22ND 2015



Village meetings were an opportunity for the Steering Group to present the results of their research and discussions. They were also a chance for the villagers to ask questions of the sub-group teams and to express their own views on the issues that would be included in the Neighbourhood Plan.

The discussions centred on the following broad topics:

- Aspects of the village that are important
- Advantages of reasonable village growth
- Concerns about new housing
- Criteria for new housing
- Facilities that should be improved or developed
- Solutions to traffic problems
- The development of businesses, amenities and recreation areas.

The next village meetings took place in February 2016, when there was the opportunity to review the Neighbourhood Plan options and give detailed feedback to the Steering Group.

The Post-It[®] note exercise

Villagers attending the two autumn public consultation events held in the village hall were invited to note concerns and ideas on Post-It[®] notes and stick them on a large aerial photograph of the village. If other people agreed, they could add a green dot; if they disagreed, they could add a red dot. The same exercise was continued when the aerial map was subsequently moved to the Church. The number of dots on a Post-It[®] note indicated the strength of feeling about the item.

The table records all the notes left on the map, whether they were endorsed or contradicted with coloured dots or whether there were no dots to indicate a preference either way. [Click here to view the table.](#)

In some cases, there were both green and red stickers on the same Post-It[®] note suggesting that the comment is controversial. It should be noted that that notes added late in the process were obviously less likely to attract green/red dots and that the exercise was open to all without any need to declare interests. Neither was there any check as to whether individuals were voting with green/red dots more than once - but the exercise still indicates general preference.

1. Overview of Outcomes from Village Meeting October 2015

Topic	Points for discussion
Aspects of the village that are important	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The centre of the village to be retained around Shop, Post Office, Village Hall, Church - The character of the village: relatively long manorial tenure - The village feels peaceful - The village has lovely vistas and visual aspects - The village has had successful pubs - Concept of a Village Green – interest in the historic ‘green’ - We want a safe village: safer for walking and cycling with access to the playground - List village assets that need to be protected and preserved
Is there any advantage to reasonable growth in the village?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Considerable agreement that reasonable development is expected - Growth would result in the possibility of a more balanced socio-economic village - Would bring younger families into the village - New people bring new ideas - More growth provides homes in a country/area where housing is short - Potential increase in business: jobs and integration with the village - Increased growth would help shop and pubs to have increased customers
Concerns about new housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Caution – don’t want a ‘dormitory village’: one that has a large percentage of commuters with no sense of being part of the village - Concerned about strip housing that takes away a sense of the Centre of the village with poor access to the central shop and village hall - Worried that new housing could look out of character in the village - Can we be more hands on with the agreed development above North Lane
Criteria for new housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Small scale housing is preferred - there is scope for housing on both sides of Northampton Road (B430) - no increase in linear housing - look at Greenbelt and see if there is cause to request an adjustment to it - create housing that would make downsizing possible for local residents

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - consider a variety of small terraces, flats, sheltered housing - keep growth in a position that gives access to the Centre of the village - create housing that attracts young families - use local builders who will understand the need for similar character and style - create clusters of houses that contribute to the management of the traffic issue: i.e. not creating more problems - encourage eco development - Maximum of development: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Starter homes – 30% o Affordable- 35% o 2/3 bedrooms 30% o 4/5 bedrooms 5% o 20 houses – maximum - Plan in five-year periods between 2017 – 2031. Max of 15% in 5 years
<p>Facilities that should be improved or developed in the village</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - internet and mobile phone access must be improved if businesses are to be encouraged - playground: increase activities – add a zip wire, a basket and a Clubhouse - one group felt that the village needs a bigger/second playing area, fitness area/place for young people - the Centre of the village should be more friendly i.e. the Shop could increase its business through friendly interaction and a welcoming approach to newcomers. Post Office hours and shop opening times need to be reviewed - could there be a café in front of the coffee shop in the warmer weather where villagers could gather for a chat.(several comments about the isolation of the elderly in the village) - the village needs allotments - improve and create cycle paths and public routes - get mains gas - solve the problem of foot and cycle traffic on Church Road – currently it is dangerous - create places for young people – teenagers - consider some village activities in the Hall, like it is in Wendlebury - restore our Duck Pond - Encourage a sense of what it means to belong to this village: more participation in village events and an increased awareness of what is available to newcomers - Create allotments

Issues around development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - important that the character of the village is maintained
New ideas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - create a cluster of houses across (east side) of the B430. Be aware of the safety issues this could cause in terms of access to the Centre - have a shop, playing field, village green (historic one) - maintain green fields - create need for a new school - investigate the idea of an Eastern bypass that would channel commuter traffic and large vehicles away from Northampton Road (not an agreed solution but a 50/50 split on one table) - restore the ancient Village Green - can we have a by-pass without a large increase in housing
How would you solve the traffic issue: speed and rat run, access	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Safety within the village is a <u>key</u> concern - Follow up asap several of the suggestions from the meeting in the summer i.e. village gates, - Reduce speed limit of B430 to 30 and within the village to 20 (look at Ardley) - Reduce weight limit on village section of B430 - Provide safe footpaths for access - Consider access to the Centre for development that is to be build on the north side of North Lane - Chicanes - Create a crossing point between the bus stops on the B430 - Maintain public footpaths and rights of way - No speed bumps as they are noisy - Mirrors on Church Lane/Close - B430 flashing speed lights throughout the village
Should we further develop businesses amenities and recreation areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Businesses: get them involved in the discussion of the Neighbourhood Plan - Create access to the village via a bicycle path from business park at Akeman Road - Encourage new business units outside of village - Amenities - Recreation areas – update playground. Consider a second recreation area on the East side of the B430 (cricket? Playground?) - The village relationship with the Manor Hotel needs to be developed as it is an historic part of our village including the Moat and the Monks Walk - Positive participation in the village by commercial entities such as: the Shop, the Manor Hotel and businesses



Neighbourhood Plan Event - Our Future
Saturday, February 6th, 10:00am - 12.30pm
or
Wednesday, February 10th, 6:00pm - 9.00pm
Village Hall www.wotgneighbourhoodplan.co.uk

The poster features a background image of a traditional stone building with a thatched roof, likely a village hall, with people gathered outside. The text is in a bold, sans-serif font, with the event title in blue and the dates and times in black. The website URL is in red.

Outcomes from Village Meeting Two February 2016

The second Village Meeting was held on Saturday, February 6th and repeated on Wednesday, February 10th, 2016. There was an attendance of 75 across both meetings. The meetings were focussed around an Exhibition organised by topic with input from the village and proposals developed forming the rest of the display panel. The topics were: Community and Economy, Housing, Environment and Public Spaces, Traffic Calming and Movement and Design. The Villagers were given a printed copy of the display panels including tick boxes so they could register their agreement or disagreement. These were collected and tabulated. The centre of this booklet contained an aerial map of the village with numbers indicating twenty-six key items. These included proposed housing sites, a village square, new village green, site for allotments and a day nursery for children, key views to protect, the village historic boundary, public footpaths both current and needed, National Cycle Network, sites for traffic calming, preserved green spaces and lanes with original verges, the Conservation area and the Greenbelt which runs through half of the village. Once the majority of the group had had a chance to look at the Exhibition, small group discussions led by a member of the Steering group occurred. This was an opportunity to enlarge on the proposals, explain in more detail and answer questions. There was a large table with an A0 map with the proposals numbered so the public could have an overview of the village and an awareness of the impact of future development. The results of the questionnaire were tabulated and there was an overwhelming majority support for these proposals to be developed into Policies.



On 20th September 2016 the Steering Group held a public meeting to consult with the village on the pre-final draft of the Neighbourhood Plan (NP). It was a well attended and a lively meeting, with over 35 villagers turning out.

The evening was a chance for villagers to hear an explanation of the contents of the final Neighbourhood Plan – how the central planning process works and how a NP fits into this; a description of the proposals put forward at the original village consultation meetings and how they were chosen and thus to discover what the Neighbourhood Plan means for the village. It was also an opportunity for any feedback to be given and questions to be asked. Diane Bohm, the Chair of the Steering Group (SG) led the presentation with support from Susan Daenke and Bob Hessian.

For those who were unable to attend, the *Executive Summary* could be seen on our website at <http://www.wotgneighbourhoodplan.co.uk/> or go to Facebook.com and search for Weston on the Green Neighbourhood Plan. Once we finalised the Plan it was made public on the website and hard copies were available at the village shop and the church.

2. HISTORIC DOCUMENTS AND PHOTOS

There are a number of historic photos kept in the village archives and others that have been consulted during the creation of the NP. Also, one of our parishioners, Norman Machin, created a file of sketches of key buildings and vistas. This collection has added greatly to our understanding the historic landscape of the village. All of these sketches are available on the NP website. Below are a few examples of this collection both as photos and sketches.



The village stocks are a key feature of the small piece of land at the junction of Church Lane and Northampton Road.



This is an artist's sketch of how the stocks would have been used.

The Chequers Pub

The Chequers is a former farm settlement, which was amalgamated into an inn and now a pub. It dates from the sixteenth century.



The Ben Jonson Pub

The Ben Jonson is so named because the most eminent writer of the Elizabethan age, Ben Jonson, is said to have stopped here on his way to Stratford upon Avon to visit his friend William Shakespeare.

BOOKLETS AND BOOKS WRITTEN ABOUT THE VILLAGE

A comprehensive village history was written to commemorate the Queen's Jubilee in the year 2000. The book is entitled "Weston Matters" by Paula Hessian and Margaret Fissenden. A copy of the book was given to each household as a commemoration of the Jubilee. Newcomers to the village are hard pressed to get a copy!

Other books written about the village of Weston on the Green:

- a) Weston Constable's book (1787-1843) was found tucked inside a wall of Hazel Cottage, which was probably the base for the old toll road.
- b) Weston on the Green, Methodist Church Centenary 1838-1938
- c) Notes from "The Village of Weston on the Green 1797-1843" by Brian Wilson.

APPENDIX B: STEERING GROUP MEETINGS 2015-18

12th March 2015	Neighbourhood meeting
27th April 2015	Neighbourhood meeting
24th September 2015	Visit by John Howell, MP, discussion on Neighbourhood Planning
2015 - 2018	Monthly reports to Parish Council
"Formative" Steering Group Meetings	
21st November 2014	Planning meeting with interested villagers
29th June 2015	Decision taken on area of work to be done
24th July 2015	Funding initial work, obtain digital mapping, working groups to describe skills needed to help with recruiting volunteers
22nd August 2015	Presentation on work plan and sign up for volunteers.
Steering Group meetings	
27th August 2015	Chair, Vice Chair, Treasurer and additional members on Steering group agreed. Draft protocol, declarations of interest statement agreed. Plan for first public meeting developed. Drop Box set up.
10th September 2015	Volunteers Code of Conduct written and agreed. Plan developed for broadening the base of the group, approach farmers, businesses. Agreement on village survey, plan launch of website, budget plan discussed; prepare storyboard for 1st public meeting. Village survey distribution planned
8th October 2015	Preliminary date for 1st draft submission set, referendum date aim in Nov 2016. Discuss consequences of new housing: traffic, parking, and delivery vehicles. Rehearse event on Oct 10th, 2016. Treasure's report, budget, website is up and running, put up banners, plan to take photographs of event. Discuss how group facilitators should lead groups at tables.
17th and 22nd October 2015	1st Village Event
12th November 2015	Village survey results analysed and presented. Initial thoughts on policies discussed.
3rd December 2015	Closed discussion with team to plan how to accelerate the work. Discussion of concerns around planned housing at the north end of the village.
10th December 2015	Planning for 2nd village meeting. Discussion of Call for sites document, discussion of unwanted housing development, continued preparation of NP policies.
14 th January 2016	Preparations for the second public meeting to include presentations on work underway based on survey and results of the first public meeting. Proposals will be presented on: Traffic calming

	<p>Sites for housing</p> <p>A Design Code that clearly outlines how new builds should conform with the look and feel of the village</p> <p>Proposal for a Public Realm Scheme that increases the facilities of the village, beautification of specific areas based on suggestions from the survey and the first village meeting</p> <p>Proposal to object to any further development at Southfield Farm. We do not want ribbon development. (Agreed)</p>
26th January 2016	Closed planning meeting for February event
6th and 10th February 2016	2nd Village Event
18th February 2016	Treasurer's Report, review of village meetings, analysis presented of responses to questionnaire, how to respond to concerns, site brief planned, leaflet drop planned to share results of questionnaire, discussion of having street coordinators, discussion of legal implications of the NP.
10th March 2016	Treasurer's report, feedback from CDC meeting, review of data from questionnaires, work on draft report, reports, from sub-groups.
14th April 2016	Discussion around sites for new housing, placement of allotments, reminder of what villagers want, overview of NP progress, report writing.
19th May 2016	Application for grant money discussed. CDC update, Southfield reserved matters on CDC website, draft plan nearly complete as a Word Doc., comments made by group, discussion by the public of alternative sites, concern about any development east of the B430 as then floodgates would be opened. Graphic design template for NP, housing site study, plans. Executive summary for distribution, aerial photo arranged.
9th June 2016	Grant money approved 5K. Written work shared on individual chapters, work to begin for screening assessment, concerns about greenbelt issue, re-drafting of some chapters, get copyright permissions, priorities for PC, Design Code draft to be sent to Cherwell for opinion, draft to be ready by end of July.
4th July 2016	Meeting with PC to update on Plan, delivery, housing sites/model
23rd August 2016	CDC has reviewed draft and commented, budget statement, 4th draft of plan presented, refine housing policy statement, splitting policies and objectives
15th September 2016	Update on street meetings: Gallosbrook Way and Knowle Lane, overview of draft for 3rd village meeting, overview of Executive summary.
20th September 2016	Third Village Event
13th October 2016	4 sites identified for development, investigate footpaths to link sites to village centre, group asked to comment, amend and refine draft. Clarification of objectives on traffic calming.

10th November 2016	October 2016 draft has been submitted to Cherwell for comments and a response has been received. The Green Belt issue is problematic as two of our sites are on it. It was noted that there are a number of examples of green belt development with villages and so SG agreed to persevere with our preferred sites. Call for sites 2016 discussed and SG note sites of concern around the village. WOTG does not need a large number of houses and the rural environment needs to be protected. Budget report.
23rd November 2016	Meeting of PC and SG to clarify draft of NP as there will be a formal proposal at the next PC meeting to have the NP accepted by the PC. Need to communicate with residents by airfield, letters of interest by local people for housing to be requested, and overview of vision for Fir Tree Farm by landowner. Support was shown for the draft plan.
7 th December 2016	Proposal to Parish Council 16.307.11 To consider and approve proposal from Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group, that the Neighbourhood Plan (as attached to this Agenda) be accepted as the formal proposed plan for the Parish, acknowledging that minor modification may be requested by statutory consultees and the Examiner of the Plan after acceptance. Cllrs. approved the proposal – unanimous decision with one abstention. 16.307.12 Subject to acceptance of the above (16.307.11) to consider the proposal that this project continue to be led by Cllr. D. Bohm as the representative of the Parish Council. Cllr. S. Davis, also involved in the project, should also be part of the project team. Cllrs. approved the proposal. Cllr. Bohm briefed councillors on the current status of the Neighbourhood Plan.
11 th January 2017	Report on feedback from CDC on draft plan. Amendments have been incorporated and agreed.
1 st February 2017	Cllr. Davis gave an update. Site-brief is being prepared for Fir Tree Farm. Appendices completed. Information needed to ascertain how many people in the village would be interested in affordable housing for themselves, family, relatives, etc.
1 st March 2017	NP is progressing with additional work on data underway. The Appendices need to be cross-referenced. The Basic Conditions statement has been written and the NP will go back to the desktop publisher for layout. Draft will go to Steering Group before presentation at Parish Council. Documents will go on the website and the PC website will provide the link.
13th April 2017	Planning of pre-submission consultation, mail shot regarding right to comment, flyers circulated with comment sheets. Consultation dates for the village is April 15th to end of May.
11th May 2017	Overview of comments to date from villagers, challenge of funding aspirations discussed, problem with lack of bus service, suggestions for amending the NP, a meeting with CDC is planned, budget tabled, DB to draft a full overview of all comments and actions/amendments.

<p>Discussions regarding the amendment to the land policy</p>	
<p>Parish Council</p>	
<p>7th June 2017</p>	<p>Discussion of the threat of development to the Schoolfield (ridge and furrow) The status of the field will be investigated and how it can be protected from damage i.e. development.</p> <p>Discussion of a further housing site put up for discussion by land owner's agent, the Baby Ben, further comments on the NP and agreed actions, report on SEA meeting with SG and CDC, update on consultation with CDC, concerns about school field sale.</p>
<p>5th July 2017</p>	<p>A developer has bought the schoolfield. This is an immediate threat to the ridge and furrow field.</p> <p>English Heritage/Historic England will be contacted to ascertain the status of the field. Historic England has suggested that we look to see if the land could be appropriate for local green space designation or even classified as a non-designated heritage asset in its own right.</p>
<p>3rd August 2017</p>	<p>PUBLIC MEETING re: Schoolfield</p> <p>Present: 80-100 people</p> <p>The Schoolfield has been sold to a developer. This has caused great concern from the village because of the historic use of the field and the assumption that the site was safe from development.</p> <p>There is an impending flood risk and lack of drainage.</p> <p>Some residents of Westlands Ave have a Section 52 clause on their mortgage agreements. There is evidence of archaeological finds on the site. We need to check the role of the field in the biodiversity plan for the village and the impact on the butterfly corridor.</p> <p>Action: an action group to be formed, volunteers requested</p>

Parish Council Reports (con't)	
6 th September 2017	<p>NP report: all Statutory and Non-Statutory comments have been considered and amendments have been made where appropriate. The document containing this information has been shared.</p> <p>Report to the Parish Council on amendments specifically having to remove both of our preferred sites as they are technically in the green belt although in the village - disappointing for the team as moving agricultural buildings and replacing with houses was very much preferred.</p> <p>Other amendments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -addition of a bio-diversity policy -addition of a Social Services Policy - addition of a Water Policy - strengthening of Design Policy - strengthening of WOTG's role in the natural rural environment -strengthening of compliance to the NPPF and Cherwell Local Plan Part 1 <p>Proposal to accept the amendments: Agreed</p> <p>Schoolfield report: the group will be called WF2 and is a single-issue action group. Two members of the PC sit on the committee – who are also Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group members. A list of topics to be investigated has been drawn up.</p> <p><i>Some further consideration of this issue needs to be done with amendments to the NP.</i></p>
6 th rd October 2017	<p>Traffic – one of the pressing issues from the NP. An Advisory Group to the PC has been appointed to move this issue along</p>

	<p>NP – team is working on policy on the enhancement of biodiversity in and around the village.</p> <p>“Recommendation that we have an additional planning policy, specifically that the schoolfield site is used as a community amenity area providing an open space that enhances wildlife biodiversity. This would ensure that the area on the west boundary of the village is an accessible corridor for wildlife and flowers from the Weston Fen SSSI through to the Otmoor SSSI. This is a recommendation from both Natural England and the Landscape Officer of OCC.”</p> <p>Motion agreed.</p>
1 st November 2017	NP – report on where we are in the process. The NP team alongside CDC is working on the SEA.
6 th December 2017	Report to the Parish Council on the Schoolfield designation as a passive recreational grassland habitat aimed to promote biodiversity. The area “comprises a possible NERC Act S41 grassland habitat - The S41 guides decision makers such a councils and statutory undertakers as to their duty, ‘to have regard to the conservation of biodiversity in England’”. The NP group is gathering information on how to maintain an ancient meadow – a grassland habitat. The requested allotments will need to be located elsewhere in the village.
10 th January 2018	Report to the Parish Council on the progress of the Strategic Environment Assessment, the last piece of the NP before submission. The Schoolfield is a key piece in the NP’s biodiversity statement. Future decisions need to be made on the role of the PC in overlooking the management of the field. Concerns raised regarding overgrazing and dog waste, which harms wildflowers.
24 th January 2018	PUBLIC MEETING – led by WF2 group Attendance – 100-120 villagers. Presentation on the work done to date on the history, importance, use of the schoolfield, designation of the field as a priority habitat, amendments to the NP to include the schoolfield in the planning policies. There was overwhelming support for this work and fundraising has begun to support the work and future challenges.

7 th February 2018	Report to the Parish Council on discussion with CDC on the rewording the section of the NP regarding the Schoolfield. The WF2 group and the NP group have agreed this. Parish Council agreed.
23 rd February 2018	Cherwell District Council prepared a draft SAE Screening Opinion.
16 th March 2018	The CDC Screening Opinion has been sent to Natural England and several other environmental agencies for comment. When these are discussed and amended, the NP will be formally submitted as all other work is completed
WF2 Meetings (Weston Front 2) Schoolfield Action Group	This group has met monthly since August 2017 but has requested that Minutes be confidential. Progress has been made on the areas of investigation and advice has been sought from a range of professionals.

Amendment to the Planning Policy June 2017 – March 2018

Background information on The Schoolfield

During the preparation of this Plan a piece of land which is known as The School Field, considered historic and not suitable for development, changed ownership and immediately came under threat of development. There was a village meeting in January 2017. The outcome was grave concern that the Schoolfield, a ridge and furrow field crossed by the Oxfordshire Way and providing a corridor for insect and plant life would be lost. An Action Group was formed with the objective of saving the field for the future of the village plus providing protection for the serenity of the northwest edge of the village. The Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group worked with this Action Group on behalf of the village to further develop our biodiversity policy. This was incorporated into the final version of our Plan and agreed by the Parish Council over several months January-March 2018

APPENDIX C: MEETINGS WITH LANDOWNERS

14.01.2016	Neil Godwin	Discussion centred around the family's history in the village, the use of land on the east of the B430
2.07.2016	Ruth Pangu	Discussion centred around land use to the south of her house, Fir Tree Farm and access to it, progress of NP, allotments on her field, She has been kept up to date on NP work, queried by email and answered.
22.08.2016	David Hopkins, Knowle Farm	Site visit, shown access route through his land to the Oxfordshire Way, meadow that could be developed. Numerous emails throughout 2016/17 regarding possible land use.
14.01.2016 2016-2017	Paul Beecroft	Meeting with committee member to discuss land use on the east of the B430, access, past dispute, traffic issues on B430. Mr. Beecroft attended all the village meetings and participated in them. He latterly sat on the Traffic Advisory Committee for the PC.
13.01.2016 29.03.2016 16.09.2016 23.11.2016 29.11.2016	John Miller	Mr Miller met with the Chair/Vice Chair of the NP Steering Group on a number of occasions to discuss the possible development on his Fir Tree Farm site near the centre of the village. A design was made for the site, had the approval of both the village and the Parish council. Ultimately, the site was not used in the NP as it is in the Green Belt, although considered an eyesore by neighbours. Meetings were held with CDC and the decision was taken to remove the from the plan

APPENDIX D: LETTER TO NON-STATUTORY CONSULTEES ON PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION AND LIST OF BUSINESSES AND RESPONDENTS

PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION FOR WESTON-ON-THE-GREEN NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

As part of the requirements of the Localism Act 2011, Weston-on-the-Green Parish Council is undertaking pre-submission consultation on its Draft Neighbourhood Plan. As a statutory consultation body, we are seeking your views on the Draft Plan document, which is now available for consultation.

The Plan is available to read and download at www.wotgneighbourhoodplan.co.uk and also through the Parish Council website at <http://www.westononthegreen-pc.gov.uk/>.

The Plan can also be consulted as a printed copy at the back of the church between April 15th and May 27th, or, at the newly opened Village Shop after April 28, 2017. You can also contact any of the Parish Councillors or members of the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group.

The pre-submission consultation runs for a period of six weeks. The closing date for representations is 27th May 2017.

We have included a copy of the Executive Summary so you will have a short version of what is in the actual plan.

Responses can be:

- emailed to <http://www.wotgneighbourhoodplan.co.uk/contact> or diane@wotgneighbourhoodplan.co.uk or parishclerkwotg@f2s.com;
- posted to Parish Clerk: Newby Cottage, Weston on the Green, OX25 3QL
- dropped in through the mail box (in this envelope), sealed and addressed to WOTG Neighbourhood Plan.

Yours sincerely

Kate Hessian (Chair of the Parish Council)

The draft Neighbourhood Plan of April 2017 was circulated to the village via the website (www.wotgneighbourhoodplan.co.uk), emails to the majority of the village with the link included, hard copies were in the village church. As there are some people who do not use the internet we also circulated copies to clusters of houses and they shared over the consultation period. We included all landowners and hand delivered letters with the same information. Businesses in the village had a letter referring them to the website. There were fifteen replies from people in the village and no replies from businesses listed below.

Businesses in Weston on the Green

Name of Company	Name of Company	Name of Company
3D Design	T J Broadbent	Control GmbH, Unit 2
Allerton & Company	Autoengineers Ltd	Continental Landscapes
Aqua Services (Oxford)	Forge Works	Dalcour Maclaren
Autofarm (1973) Ltd	The Chequers Pub	David Beecroft Ltd
Axicon Group	The Milk Shed	RAF Weston on the Green
BENQ, Staplehurst	The Old Flight House	East Tone UK, Bumble
BP Family Farm + M&S Simply Food, A34	The Woodworks	Clumps
Clearpower Limited,	Transense Technologies plc	Framptons, Staplehurst
Isis Windows	TVT, Unit 8 Oddington	G & M Safety, Unit 21
		GN ReSound, Building A

Kel-Berg Trailer and Trucks Ltd	Grange Farm & Industries	Godwins Caravan & Camping Park and Ice Cream Parlour
Kidlington Pipe Work	Weston Garage, Bicester	
Mr Sidique Butt T/A S	Weston Manor Hotel	GPD Communications
Oxford Fine Dining Ltd.	Zeon Healthcare Limited	Inside Out Interiors Ltd
R & F Motor Technicians	Phoenix Body Shop	
Salunda Ltd, Oddington	Signavision	
Grange Farm Industries	Wells Fabrications	
Seeneys Animal & Pet Feeds	Oxford Health NHS	
Sigmavision Ltd	Foundations Trust	
PA Turney	Telespeak	
Dawson Rentals	Transgene Technology	
	R & F Motortech	

Villagers who replied to the consultation April – May 2017

Name	Name
Andrew Wilson Chair of Village Hall Committee	Richard and Adrienne Evans
Jordanna Riches	Phil Price
Wiz and Denise Bunce	Simon Davis
Tony and Jane Henman	Mary Warmington
Margaret Fissenden	John Roper
Robin Stafford- Allen	Paul Beecroft
GVA Co.Ltd	Malcolm and Kau Brain
Reps for Adrian Wilcox a local landowner	Kerry and Russell Morris

APPENDIX E COMMENTS, RESPONSE AND ACTION TO NON-STATUTORY CONSULTEES

Date Rec'd	From	Comments	Date replied	Response
14/04/17	Andrew Wilson Chair of Village Hall Committee	<p>A cursory glance at the Village Hall's schedule for next month will surely prove the point: 3 village club bookings (evenings), a quiz night, two daytime bookings and one day as a polling station. Out of 93 available sessions in the month the hall is booked for 11. Of these 11, 3 are monthly village group meetings and 1 is an event organised by the Village Hall Committee. The only event specifically requested by a villager is a birthday party, for which they require the morning to set up and so accounts for 2 sessions. Demand, by no stretch of the imagination, outstrips availability.</p> <p>Apart from one meeting I had with you at your house in January 2016, I am not aware of any formal discussion that has taken place with any member of the committee or our trustees.</p> <p>. the expansion that had been proposed by the Steering Group was wholly impractical and would not be in any way supported by the Committee, who are</p>	11/07/17	<p>It was agreed at the Steering Group Meeting (May 11th, 2017) that "the section on the Memorial Village Hall will be rewritten to remove the tone of a demand.</p> <p>To quote from the Steering Group Minutes of May 11th, 2017, " ...informed the meeting of the challenges faced trying to balance the Hall booking with the various demands from both villagers and outside groups. Outside groups often request a series of bookings in advance".</p> <p>The Steering Group has met monthly for two years in the Village Hall, a meeting open to the public and to all groups within our community. We advertise around the village, in the Newsletter, publish reports of our meetings and have a website with up to date information. There was a meeting as stated in January 2016 with continued opportunities to be involved in the consultation process. As the Action Plan from the Report goes ahead through the Parish Council, the Memorial Village Hall Committee should contribute to</p>

Date Rec'd	From	Comments	Date replied	Response
		<p>We have discussed the proposals at Committee meetings in the past and the consensus has been that we are not in agreement with the proposed additions to the Village Hall.</p> <p>...other "improvements" such as cafe/refreshments area/business hub are pie-in-the-sky ideas with no real thought of the practicalities.</p>		<p>There were conversations with the Trustees. An early conversation provided an understanding of the membership and purpose of the Memorial Village Hall. One Trustee said that he had not had anything to do with the group for years. Since then, we have reached out to three Trustees.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan seeks to anticipate the use/demand reflecting the proposed increase in the village population up to 2031. The Plan reflects the aspirations expressed in the public meetings. (October 2015 February 2016). Discussion about the village centre would involve the Village Hall Committee from the outset.</p>
19/04/17	<p>Jordanna Riches</p> <p>Management Trustee of the Village Hall</p>	<p>Statements regarding difficulty in booking the Hall for village activities are inaccurate.</p>	11/07/17	<p>The Booking Secretary attended our Steering Group Meeting on May 11th 2017 and there was a full discussion about Hall bookings. To quote from the Minutes, " ...informed the meeting of the challenges faced trying to balance the Hall booking with the various demands from both villagers and outside</p>

Date Rec'd	From	Comments	Date replied	Response
				groups. Outside groups often request a series of bookings in advance and best efforts are made to ensure that villagers are not denied use of the Hall".
20/04/17	Jordanna Riches	<p>“Firstly I would like to congratulate the members of the Neighbourhood Planning Group for a very detailed and comprehensive report. The dedication and hard work shines through. It is incredibly well presented.</p> <p>I was particularly pleased to note the following:</p> <p>4.2 Housing: A7 (and the possible addition of 4 new houses.4.3 A17: An allotment ground should be allocated</p> <p>A19: The ancient village green should be restored. I would hope the village would preserve the ‘dark skies’ policy as it is one of the things about Weston that makes it unique and a pleasure to live in.</p> <p>I was a little wary of Environment Policy E3 on pg. 56, which seems to contradict the objective of preserving</p>	11/07/17	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>See Policy E4</p> <p>The same protection of dark skies will be in place.</p>

Date Rec'd	From	Comments	Date replied	Response
		<p>the 'dark skies'.</p> <p>(Theme 3a on P60). There is an inaccurate fact printed here say "it is booked months in advance, often by organisations outside the village, making it difficult for village groups to find space The car park, ..is a private car park belonging to the Village Hall</p>		<p>Noted – see comment above with report from Booking Secretary at the Steering Group May 2017</p> <p>Noted – discussions regarding the village centre will include all groups</p>
14/04/17	Wiz and Denise Bunce	<p>We concur with many of the suggestions, particularly, housing, the slowing/controlling of traffic on the B430 and attempts to re-introduce public transport.</p> <p>One concern I have is that I have read recently of Oxfordshire's wish to introduce a unitary authority, which I note Cherwell are, quite rightly strongly opposed to. If however, this did come about how would this affect a Neighbourhood Plan?</p> <p>Chapter 5, Sec 3a states – Extending the Village Hall facilities .. regarding bookings. It is not true that the hall is 'booked months in advance, .. 'outside' hires are needed to maintain a level of income required to</p>	11/07/17	<p>Noted</p> <p>The status of the Neighbourhood Plan will not be affected.</p> <p>The tone of this section will be changed. For any change to take place, the consent needs to come from the Management Committee of the VH</p> <p>NP Steering Group met on May 11th and the notes state: " The Booking Secretary informed the meeting of the challenges faced trying to balance the Hall bookings with the various demand from both villagers</p>

Date Rec'd	From	Comments	Date replied	Response
		support the Hall and its fabric.		and outside groups.
01/05/2017	Tony and Jane Henman	The Plan is excellent and our congratulations for the hard work and expertise by all. However, we are extremely concerned about the Ci and Cii site, which is seriously contaminated and has been for some years.		Note that Ci and Cii sites have now been removed as part of the Neighbourhood Plan as they are within the Green Belt.
01/05/17	Richard and Adrienne Evans	It will never be safe to access the children's area/sports field unless there is a footpath from the church west along the Bletchington Road.	22/06/17	Finding a solution to this problem is part of the first actions on the Action Plan. See 5.4 MONITORING Years 1-5: Improvements to existing village community facilities
01/05/17	Phil Price	Appendix D fig A14/A15 I refer to the above tables concerning traffic usage of the roads/lanes in Weston. I note fig A14 indicates approx. 133/per hour use the B430/Church lane turns and roughly over half are exceeding the 30 mph speed limit. The traffic usage for B430 (208/per hour north bound & 136 per hour south bound) is also a big	15/06/17	This is a key priority on the Action Plan. See 5.4 MONITORNG. There is an Advisory Group on the Parish Council charged with sourcing funding for the application to change the speed limit.

Date Rec'd	From	Comments	Date replied	Response
		<p>concern ..</p> <p>The traffic calming in Church Lane should be a priority on the grounds of basic safety. In the interim a reduction to 20 mph should be instigated</p> <p><u>Public transport</u></p> <p>The bus S5 (Bicester to Oxford) passes the village on a fairly regular basis</p> <p>Could we conduct a village survey to see how many people would use the bus if it were stopping in the village? (Commuters, shoppers, school children etc).</p> <p>We could make a fresh approach supported with data from a village survey</p>		<p>Noted</p> <p>The suggestion of a village survey to see how many people would use the bus is very helpful and will be passed on to the Transport Advisory Group. It would be useful if we could identify commuters to Oxford Parkway so we could have steady use of bus services as well as regular trips to Oxford/Bicester.</p>
14/05/17	Simon Davis	<p>I agree very strongly, along with the findings of your consultation, that there needs to be careful management of the growth of the village, in ways that preserve its special character.The great value of the Plan, as outlined, is that it offers the residents real hope that similar developments won't necessarily be imposed ad hoc upon the village for the foreseeable</p>	11/07/17	<p>It is important to have careful management of the growth of the village in ways that preserve its special character. See Housing and Land Use Policy H1</p> <p>The list of important spaces is key to the preservation</p>

Date Rec'd	From	Comments	Date replied	Response
		future.... I was also very pleased to see that the many features of the village that give it its rural character, especially the open spaces, the ponds and the verges will be given special, perhaps even retro-active protection.		of the important characteristics of the village. See Environment Policies E1 through to E6
15/05/17	Mary Warmington	As a cyclist I the village, I find it very dangerous, particularly on approaching the main road near the stocks. ...Bicycle tracks should be made essential from village to village. Also we have NO BUSES. Pensioners like myself are paying up to twenty pound to get from Bicester or Park and Ride.Village to city communication is essential for less crowding of motorways by private cars. Our village along Bletchington Road (Church Road) is "choc-a-bloc" at certain times of the day with private cars I am a continual witness to speeds well above the limit and feel an "endangered species" on my bike.	27/06/17	The issue of traffic management is considered to be one of the first issues to be tackled by the Parish Council. Bicycle tracks from village to village would be helpful. See 5.4 Monitoring Years 1-5 for the Action Plan.
	Margaret Fissenden	Chapter 5, Section a) I think it is overstating the use of the Hall, perhaps, by outsiders. I congratulate the group on the work done on the plan.	11/07/17	The Booking Secretary attended our Steering Group Meeting on May 11 th 2017 and we were able to have a full discussion about Hall bookings. To quote from the Minutes, " ..informed the meeting of the challenges faced trying to balance the Hall booking with the

Date Rec'd	From	Comments	Date replied	Response
		It is a worthwhile and significant representation of my community both past, present and looking forward.		various demands from both villagers and outside groups. Outside groups often request a series of booking in advance and she makes her best efforts to ensure that villagers are not denied use of the Hall”.
11/04/17	Robin Stafford-Allen	<p>a. Community To round off the essential village amenities which now include an enlarged and updated Village Shop/PO and a well-used Village Hall, it is essential that a bus service be re-installed.</p> <p>b. Those involved in drawing up the Plan are to be congratulated on its presentation, and comprehensiveness. it.</p>	11/07/17	The need for a regular bus service is a priority for the Parish Council in the development plan. We will have new homes for young families and there will be an increased need to get to Bicester, the Parkway and into Oxford by bus. The cancellation of the bus service increases cars on the road and hence pollution and also disadvantages the elderly who may not drive or who have ceased to drive.
14/06/17	Paul Beecroft	<p><u>OBSERVATIONS REGARDING WESTON ON THE GREEN NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN</u></p> <p>First let me praise all concerned in producing such a well set out and informed Neighbourhood Plan, and I do not want to give any negative feedback through the emailed response channels.</p>	11/07/17	<p>Noted</p> <p>It has been very important to hear from people like yourself, as you say, a resident, landowner and business owner in the final stages of the report. It is appreciated that you attended public meetings,</p>

Date Rec'd	From	Comments	Date replied	Response
		<p>As a resident, landowner, and business owner we appear to have had little consultation.</p> <p>Church Lane – Church Road There appears to have been no local meeting, so how can footpaths and traffic calming measures be put forward as no local consultation were held.</p> <p>Alterations to Church Road off B430 If something were to be done to alleviate the rat run that is Church Lane – Church Road, no alterations would be required at this junction ..</p> <p>Excessive Traffic on B430 .. why can this not be a 30mph speed limit with HGV limited access only and why should dustbin lorries be allowed to travel (at speed) through a weight restricted area. they should be routed round via the M40 and approach the B430 and the waste disposal facility from the North at Junction 10 like all other HGV tippers.</p> <p>Village Hall and Surrounding Area I have reservations about the number of car parking spaces lost as it is Church Lane that becomes a car park at</p>		<p>several Steering Group meetings and have tried to participate in the transport sub-committee.</p> <p>Church Lane – Church Road</p> <p>We had committed to a series of street meetings to discuss issues that involve the residents. We have had several including Gallosbrook Way and Church Close (the latter through door to door consultation) and then a meeting with Church Road/Church Lane. (Meeting occurred in September 2017)</p> <p>Alterations to Church Road off B430 and excessive traffic on B430</p> <p>We have asked about having the speed limits reduced throughout the village and along the B430. A traffic survey has been done which provides clear evidence of the overuse of the village lanes/road for commuter traffic.</p> <p>Reducing the traffic on the B430 is a priority.</p> <p>Memorial Village Hall and surrounding area</p> <p>The artist's impression of a pretty central area is not a</p>

Date Rec'd	From	Comments	Date replied	Response
		<p>busy events at the Church and the Village Hall</p> <p>The Ancient Village Green This is not shown on any plans, but if it is where I believe it to be to the east of the B430, as a landowner of some of this land, should I not have been consulted before inclusion?</p> <p>Housing Site 'A' I am disappointed to hear that Site 'A' will not have to include a roundabout.</p> <p>Housing Site 'B' appears not to be a new proposal but must emphasise my objection to this, prior to any traffic calming being installed in Church Lane, as currently it is very dangerous for pedestrians in various locations.</p> <p>Residents in Upper Weston feel ostracised and not part of the village. There has been little or no consultation with them, and Upper Weston does not appear to be mentioned in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Is this the only housing proposed until 2030 as there</p>		<p>design plan but an indication that we could add to the improvements that have already been made around the Hall. The issue was discussed with the Chair of the Village Hall. Ideas from all groups in the village could add to the discussion.</p> <p>The Ancient Village Green The land on the east of the B430 is treasured as an open, green space .and the village has historically rejected development there (Weston Otmoor debate and village choices for new housing 2016).</p> <p>Housing Site A The Parish Council did request a roundabout at this site but OCC Transport did not consider it necessary.</p> <p>Housing Site B This site has been removed from the NP.</p> <p>Leaflets were distributed throughout the north end of the village and invitations to attend village meetings</p> <p>Noted <i>(the term Upper Weston does not appear in the NP as it is an informal designation and not a term</i></p>

Date Rec'd	From	Comments	Date replied	Response
		<p>are several sites that at present are not being proposed now, which due to different constraints but are likely to be applied for before 2030?</p>		<p><i>commonly used)</i></p> <p>We have tried to plan for the future and be cooperative in the need for housing without affecting the character of our village.</p>
15/06/17	<p>Malcolm and Kau Brain</p> <p>Kerry and Russell Morris</p>	<p>“Key Green Spaces” F, G and H should never be developed, as for ‘Local Green Space’ as stated in E5 Part of ‘G’ is not quite ridge and furrow but equally should be preserved.</p> <p>In TO2 reference is made to diversion of footpaths, funded by developer contributions – concerned that this could be seen by a potential developer as an invitation to ‘buy’ a planning permission.</p> <p>Site allocations – concerned that the plan prefers building in the Green Belt to slightly extending the village along the B430. In addition to sites A & B housing density within the village should not be increased.</p>	11/07/117	<p>Noted</p> <p>The development at the north end of the village has a requirement or a footpath as part of the planning permission.</p> <p>The site in the Green Belt has been withdrawn. Members of the village have been very clear in all the consultations that development along the B430 must cease.</p>

Response to the Regulation 14 Consultation from GVA (a real estate company) submitted on behalf of Village Foundations (a specialist building and investment company) representing the Baby Ben site on the east side of the B430

<p>2018/04</p>	<p>Concern/comment</p> <p>. GVA communicated a “representations to the Neighbourhood Plan, Weston on the Green”. This was submitted on behalf of Village Foundations. “Village Foundations are a specialist building and investment company set up to respond to the challenges facing rural communities in England, particularly the lack of specialist housing suitable for retirement and for the younger generation. “</p>	<p>1/07/17</p>	<p>WOTG Comments – some additional info June 2018</p>
----------------	--	----------------	--

Response to the Regulation 14 Consultation from GVA (a real estate company) submitted on behalf of Village Foundations (a specialist building and investment company) representing the Baby Ben site on the east side of the B430

	<p>2.3 Whilst the Pre-Submission version of the Weston-on-the-Green Neighbourhood Plan refers to a Basic Condition Statement having been prepared, this has not been made available for comment as part of the Pre-Submission consultation exercise.</p>		<p>2.3 The Basic Conditions Statement was not included for the pre-submission consultation. It could not be completed as the SEA Screening exercise had not been completed.</p>
	<p>2.4 Based on the documentation subject to this consultation, the current version of the Neighbourhood Plan does not meet these Basic Conditions</p>		<p>2.4 This is a work in progress and not the final plan.</p>
	<p>3.6 It is clear therefore, that in order to meet objectively assessed housing needs, be consistent with strategic policies of the Cherwell Development Plan and thereby secure its longevity, the Weston-on-the-Green Neighbourhood Plan must allocate sufficient sites for the delivery of housing.</p>		<p>3.6 We do not need to identify sites for more dwellings than we have identified in Site A.</p>
	<p>3.8 Excluding Site A, which already has planning permission, the Neighbourhood Plan therefore identifies 2 new sites for development which are stated as having capacity to deliver up to 34 new homes.</p>		<p>3.8 Agreement for Site A falls within the time frame of the NP. Other sites have been removed from the NP.</p>

Response to the Regulation 14 Consultation from GVA (a real estate company) submitted on behalf of Village Foundations (a specialist building and investment company) representing the Baby Ben site on the east side of the B430

	3.9 Site C is located within the Green Belt .		3.9 This site has been removed from the NP.
	3.10 On the basis that Site C cannot be considered deliverable; the Neighbourhood Plan in fact identifies just one new site for development, which is suggested as being capable of delivering 4 affordable dwellings. The Neighbourhood Plan does not therefore secure the delivery of housing for the elderly or young people (the housing need identified) and this represents a 1.7% increase in the current dwelling stock of the Parish (229 dwellings at 2011).		3.10 The NP provides 20 new homes on Site A. (see above)
	3.11 This level of proposed growth, will not boost the supply of housing for the local community. As identified by the Neighbourhood Plan (p95) 70% of village residents (Survey 1) agreed that more housing should be built in the village, identifying the need to attract young people to the village as being the main motivation (33% of respondents wanted young people), closely followed by the need to accommodate retirees (26% of respondents) who wish to stay in the village but may need alternative accommodation types.		3.11 The total number of dwellings identified within the Neighbourhood Plan is constrained by the presence of the Green Belt (see also under para 3.6 above). However Site A provides 20 new homes, some affordable and the rest modern in internal design which will suit specific mobility needs. (Housing Policy 1) Further housing will be provided by infill, conversion and minor developments. (Housing Policy H2)
	3.12 Furthermore, in light of the Local Plan Part 1 Review this level of growth is not considered		3.12 It is important to note that the Parish Council and the NP Steering has a vision for the village, which is based around reasonable development within the village

Response to the Regulation 14 Consultation from GVA (a real estate company) submitted on behalf of Village Foundations (a specialist building and investment company) representing the Baby Ben site on the east side of the B430

	sufficient to ensure the longevity of the Neighbourhood Plan and resist possible future speculative development in the village.		envelope whilst maintaining our dark skies and rural feel. The Plan resists possible future speculative development in the village. WOTG is not expected to make up numbers for Oxford's unmet need
	3.13 It is therefore recommended that in order to meet Basic Tests a) and e) and secure the longevity of the Plan support for Site C should be removed and at least one other site should be supported for residential development. That site should be capable of delivering a mix of dwellings (market and affordable), which responds to the identified housing needs of the village.		3.13 We do not need to substitute a new site for Site C in order to meet our housing need.
	4.2 Based on the documentation subject to this consultation, there is no evidence to demonstrate that the current version of the Neighbourhood Plan has been informed by a sufficient and proportionate evidence base.		4.2 Consultation process is transparent. Individuals, groups, landowners & businesses have all been given the opportunity to give their views
	4.3 This is particularly concerning given that the Neighbourhood Plan allocates sites for development, including one site (Site C) which is in the Green Belt and a considerable distance from the village centre. The Inspector of the Storrington, Sullington and Washington Neighbourhood Plan in Horsham found that the Plan could not pass Basic Test d because it		4.3 Site A is within walking distance of the village centre. The developer is expected to build a path to join into North Lane which connects through lanes village shop. There are trails and walking paths throughout the village that give evidence of regular foot traffic to the current shop as well as to the previous site. (See Schoolfield

Response to the Regulation 14 Consultation from GVA (a real estate company) submitted on behalf of Village Foundations (a specialist building and investment company) representing the Baby Ben site on the east side of the B430

	proposed a site for development which was not within walking distance of the local facilities and therefore could not be regarded as a sustainable location for development.		trails, North Lane to Westlands Avenue through to shop)
	4.4 Paragraph ID 11-026-20140306 of the NPPG states that a qualifying body must demonstrate how its plan will contribute to achieving sustainable development and a sustainability appraisal may be a useful approach for doing this. A sustainability appraisal is intended to be an integral part of the preparation of a plan and therefore work on the appraisal should start at the same time as work starts on developing the plan.		4.4 At the time of this consultation the Screening Assessment was not complete. This is available on further drafts on the NP website
	4.7 The Inspector of the Wantage Neighbourhood Plan in the Vale of White Horse was unable to support that Plan on the basis that it did not promote sustainable development.		4.7 Weston on the Green is a weak Category A village. Further development is not considered necessary in this area and Oxford's unmet need will be met with larger developments.
	5.4 WOTG has not been screened against the requirements of the SEA Directive and has not been informed by the advice of consultation bodies (e.g. Natural England and the Environmental Agency)		5.4 Agree that it is essential that we get consultation feedback from the 3 statutory agencies. (English Heritage, Natural England and the Environment Agency) This consultation has occurred – completed February 2018

Response to the Regulation 14 Consultation from GVA (a real estate company) submitted on behalf of Village Foundations (a specialist building and investment company) representing the Baby Ben site on the east side of the B430

			<p><i>This work was done January – April 2018) All updates have been posted on our website. Residents including the owner of the land you are representing have had several emails to alert them to update their awareness of the NP. Comments have consistently been encouraged. (June 2018)</i></p> <p><i>The issue of sustainable development balanced with a responsible biodiversity policy has been the focus from January-June 2018.</i></p>
	<p>5.8 As the Neighbourhood Plan allocates sites for development it will also be necessary to assess the impact of ‘reasonable alternative’ sites which could have been allocated, in order to demonstrate why the sites ultimately allocated represent the most suitable sites with the least environmental impact.</p>		<p>5.8 We are doing this. Note our recent work on the Schoolfield. We have looked at biodiversity, historical use, water supply, flood risk, and roads.</p> <p>We have also looked at the HELLA 2018 and agree there are no suitable sites on our boundaries.</p>
	<p>5.10 Evidence of alternative sites, which could and should have been considered by the Neighbourhood Plan, is available within Table 14 of the Cherwell Local Plan Part 1 Partial Review - Options Consultation paper published in November 2016. This table, including the land controlled by Village Foundations, known as Baby Ben Field, identifies several ‘potential</p>		<p>5.10 We have discussed all the potential strategic development sites at Parish Council level, including those shown in the table referred to in the Cherwell Options Consultation paper referred to in 5.10.</p>

Response to the Regulation 14 Consultation from GVA (a real estate company) submitted on behalf of Village Foundations (a specialist building and investment company) representing the Baby Ben site on the east side of the B430

	strategic development sites' in Weston-on-the-Green.		<i>Recent work has included the HELLA 2018</i>
	6.4 It is not clear what existing areas of 'open space' Policy E1 catches. Figure 14 of the Neighbourhood Plan identifies 3 types of open space, including 'containing landscape' which encapsulates the entire edge of the settlement. Whilst Appendix G seeks to justify the identification of land around the settlement edge as being important to the landscape setting, in many instances, there are no special features, characteristics or qualities of the land identified which justify why it should be conserved through the Neighbourhood Plan.		6.4 We will make this point clear on the final draft, as Historic England has been helpful in this regard. <i>Reference August 2018 draft on website.</i>
	6.6 The adopted Development Plan for Cherwell does not define settlement boundaries and the Weston-on-the-Green Neighbourhood Plan does not at any point define a settlement boundary for the village either.		6.6 The settlement boundary is the built up area as seen on Figure 8 (Character areas - from the WOTG Conservation Appraisal 2009)

APPENDIX F: LETTER TO STATUTORY CONSULTEES ON PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION

Dear,

We are writing to you as a Statutory Consultee for our Neighbourhood Plan.

The Neighbourhood Plan for Weston on the Green is now ready for you to read in final draft form. We have a six week pre-submission to Cherwell District Council consultation, starting on April 14th, 2017 ending on May 26th at 2400 hours. We will respond to all queries and submit the draft the Cherwell District Council.

Please take the opportunity to read the document in full.

Please download the plan from the Weston on the Green website, the hyperlink is below:

<http://www.wotgneighbourhoodplan.co.uk> (see the homepage)

We have also provided a comment sheet that you can use to respond to the plan.

Please refer to the specific chapter and section that you want to discuss.

The Neighbourhood Plan is a vision of how Weston on the Green can develop over the next fifteen years, 2017-31.

Regards

Diane

email: diane@wotgneighbourhoodplan.co.uk

address: Oddtymes, Northampton Road, OX25.3QX, Weston on the Green, Oxfordshire, UK. OR: parishclerkwotg@f2s.com

APPENDIX G STATUTORY CONSULTEES FOR PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION (MAY-JULY 2017)

Name	Contact	Address	Date sent	Date received
Anglian Water		planningliaison@anglianwater.co.uk	10/07/2017	11/07/2017
Bletchington Parish Council	Mrs Rebecca McNaught	blethpc@btinternet.com	10/07/2017	nil
BT Group PLC		gssb@bt.com	10/07/2017	nil
Canal and River Trust	Anne Denby	Anne.denby@canalrivrtrust.org.uk	10/07/2017	14/07/20217
Charlton-on-Otmoor Parish Council	Samantha Hatwell	skh65@btinternet.com	10/07/2017	nil
Cherwell District Council	Cllr. Timothy Hallchurch	cllr.timothy.hallchurch@cherwell-dc.gov.uk	01/07/2017	nil
Cherwell District Council	Cllr. Simon Holland	cllr.simon.holland@cherwell-dc.gov.uk	10/07/2017	nil
Cherwell District Council	Cllr. David Hughes	cldr.david.hugher@cherwell-dc.gov.uk	10/07/2017	nil
Cherwell District Council, Planning Policy	Christina Cherry	christina.cherry@cherwell-dc.gov.uk	Separate chart	Continuous over 3 years
Chesterton Parish Council	Mr V W Keeble	victorkeeble@btinternet.com	10/07/2017	nil
Coal Authority	Miss Rachael Bust	planningconsultation@coal.gov.uk	10/07/2017	nil

EDF Energy			10/07/2017	nil
EE		public.affairs@ee.co.uk	10/07/2017	nil
English Heritage	Martin Small	martin.small@english-heritage.org.uk	01/02/2018	25/03/2018
Highways England	Mr David Abbott	david.abbott@highwaysengland.co.uk	10/07/2017	20/07/2017
Historic England	Robert Lloyd-Sweet	robertlloydsweet@HistoricEngland.org.uk	15/04/2017	26/05/20217
Homes and Communities Agency	Peter Wynn	peter.wynn@hca.gsi.gov.uk	10/07/2017	nil
Homes and Communities Agency	Stephanie Ainsworth	stephanie.ainsworth@hca.gsi.gov.uk	10/07/2017	nil
Homes and Communities Agency	Generic	mail@homesandcommunities.co.uk	10/07/2017	nil
Islip Parish Council	Ms L A Dent	clerkislippc@hotmail.co.uk	10/07/2017	nil
Kirtlington Parish Council	Ruth M Powles	rmpowles@easynet.co.uk	10/07/2017	nil
National Grid	Brian Green	brian.green2@uk.ngrid.com		
Natural England	Zoe Buddle	consultations@naturalengland.org.uk	10/07/2017	25/07/2017

Network Rail Infrastructure Ltd		townplanninglnw@networkrail.co.uk	10/07/2017	nil
Oddington Parish Meeting	Dr Adrian Young	adrian@young99.fsworld.co.uk	10/07/2017	nil
Oxfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group		oxon.gpc@nhs.net	10/07/2017	14/08/2017
Oxfordshire County Council	Linda Currie	linda.currie@oxfordshire.gov.uk	10/07/2017	15/08/2017
Oxfordshire County Council	Cllr Anthony Gearing	anthony.gearing@oxfordshire.gov.uk	10/07/12017	as above
Powergen Plc			10/07/2017	nil
Scotia Gas	Jane Crowley	Jane.Crowley@scotiagasnetworks.co.uk	10/07/2017	nil
Scottish and Southern Electric (SSE)	Chris Gaskell	chris.gaskell@sse.com	10/07/2017	11/07/2017
Scottish Power			10/07/2017	nil
Severn Trent Water Ltd		paul.evans@severntrent.co.uk	10/07/2017	nil
St. Mary's Church, Akeman Benefice	Theff Everett	theff.everett@gmail.com	11/05/2017	13/06/2017 nil
Thames Water	Thames Water c/o Carmelle Bell	ctbell@savills.com	10/07/2017	09/08/2017
Three		jane.evans@three.co.uk	10/07/2017	nil

Vodafone & O2		EMF.Enquiries@ctil.co.uk	10/07/2017	nil
Wendlebury Parish Council	Ms Jane Olds	wendleburypc.gmail.com	10/07/2017	nil
Western Power	Graeme Hill	gshill@westernpower.co.uk	10/07/2017	nil
Western Power	Alex Wilkes	awilkes@westernpower.co.uk	10/07/2017	nil

SCHEDULE OF COMMENTS FROM STATUTORY CONSULTEES

	Organisation	Response	Action
5	Cherwell District Council	<p>We are particularly pleased to note that many of the issues and discussions that have been on-going between us and the Steering Group are now reflected in the plan.</p> <p>Mapping/ Diagrams</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where necessary all the plans, maps, diagrams and photographs should include details such as source, licences, acknowledgements, scales etc. • It may also be helpful to increase the scale of some of the maps to make them easier to read. <p>Foreword</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Given the recommended changes to the housing allocations (see later comments) there will need to be a change to the statement in para 4 referring to 20% growth in village. <p>Executive Summary</p> <p>Housing Policies</p> <p>References to Site B (Gallosbrook Way) and Site C (Fir Tree Farm) should be deleted from the Executive Summary to reflect recommendations and earlier discussions regarding the identification of housing sites within the Green Belt. (Further comments on this subject are set out below)</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Done</p>

	Organisation	Response	Action
		<p>Planning Policy – Housing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The percentages of 30% Starter Homes, 35% Affordable and 30% appear in the Summary but do not appear anywhere else in the document. Whilst we are pleased to note that these requirements fall within the scope of the adopted policies of the Cherwell Local Plan, the Neighbourhood Plan’s detailed requirements will need to be clearly evidenced. Appendix D sets out some of the village survey results but it is not clear from there how these figures were reached. • Reference is also made to ‘starter homes’. Do you have a definition for this? There is a definition of affordable housing in Annex 2 of the NPPF. This would preclude the Plan from asking for ‘starter homes’ in addition to ‘affordable homes’. If the Plan has another definition in mind this will have to be explained or the term ‘starter homes’ replaced by another term. • The Housing Section in the main body of the Plan will need to have a policy and explanation on this. <p>3</p> <p>Para 1.1: It may be helpful to update the second paragraph along the following lines. Quoted dates will also need to be revised. The next stages are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The Qualifying body submits the NP to the local planning authority (lpa) The lpa checks that the submitted proposal complies with all the relevant legislation. 	<p>Note: Housing and Land Use Policies H2</p> <p>Noted and deleted</p> <p>Inserted in text</p>

	Organisation	Response	Action
		<p>iii) If the lpa finds that the plan meets the legal requirements it: -publicises the proposal for a minimum 6 weeks and invites representations -notifies consultation bodies referred to in the consultation statement -appoints an independent examiner (with the agreement of the qualifying body).</p> <p>iv) Independent Examination</p> <p>v) Referendum and Making the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Table A: Revise dates to reflect delay in submitting to CDC and additional consultation by Neighbourhood Plan Forum prior to submission.</p> <p>•P13: There is a reference here to Diane’s personal media accounts. To protect privacy we would strongly recommend that this reference be removed.</p> <p>•Chapter 2</p> <p>•2.2 It may be helpful in this paragraph to state that the Weston on the Green Conservation Area was first designated in October 2000. A Conservation Area Appraisal was undertaken in 2009, which resulted in amendments to the Conservation Area boundary.</p> <p>•Fig 6: The source of this Plan should be acknowledged. Fig 8: This is an interesting and useful plan but due to its scale it is difficult to read. Is it possible to reproduce it at a bigger scale?</p> <p>•2.5 Use of the term ‘Local Green Spaces’. Figure 14 and Appendix G identifies a number of ‘local green spaces’ throughout the village. It is important that the Neighbourhood Plan reflects the correct terminology when making such references and distinguishes them from other areas of amenity/open space within the Plan area.</p>	<p>Amended</p> <p>Deleted</p> <p>Updated</p> <p>See 2.4 Landscape and Local Green</p> <p>Spaces Figure 15</p>

	Organisation	Response	Action
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In order to formally designate ‘local green spaces’ there needs to be a specific policy in the Neighbourhood Plan which does this. There is not one at present. Secondly, there needs to be robust evidence that each of the proposed green spaces meets national policy requirements. • The NPPF (paragraph 75) states that local communities through local and neighbourhood plans can identify local green areas of particular importance to them as ‘Local Green Spaces’. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities can rule out new development other than in very special circumstances. Local Green space designation is therefore a restrictive and significant policy equivalent to Green Belt. • Paragraph 77 then goes on to state that such a designation will not be appropriate for most green areas or open space. The designation should only be used: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves. 2. Where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds particular local significance, for example, because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife. 3. Where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land. <p style="margin-left: 20px;">Having regard to the above advice it is essential that the Neighbourhood Plan clearly demonstrates that the requirements for the allocation of each individual local green space are met in full. <i>To this end compelling evidence is required to demonstrate that any such allocation meets national policy</i></p> 	<p>Note: Policy E.6</p> <p>Amended</p> <p>Amended</p>

	Organisation	Response	Action
		<p>requirements. Failure to do this could result in the Plan failing to meet one of the Basic Conditions. Having reviewed the local green spaces described in Appendix G it is suggested that some of the sites do not meet these requirements. Sites of particular concern include the private gardens and grass verges. The Neighbourhood Plan will therefore need to make a clear distinction between existing amenity space, and play areas and formal proposals for NPPF defined local green space designations.</p> <p>Chapter 5: Vision, Objectives and Policies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Figures 19 and 20 will need to be amended to reflect the proposed changes in the identified housing sites. (See comments below). • Housing site B should be removed and Sites C (i) and (ii) should be labelled as ‘potential rural exception sites’. • Figure 20 needs a key. <p>Environmental policies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy E5 refers to Local Green Spaces. The Plan currently does not propose any designation of local green spaces. If it is decided to designate such spaces then there will need to be a specific policy. (See comments above). <p>Theme 2 - Housing and Land Use</p> <p>As we have previously discussed on several occasions Policy Villages 1 of the adopted Cherwell Local Plan restricts development at Weston on the Green to infilling and</p>	<p>Note: App G</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Note: Policy E.6</p>

	Organisation	Response	Action
		<p>conversions only within the Green Belt area of the built-up limits of the village. Minor development is, however, provided for within the non-Green Belt part of the village's built up area. It should also be noted that Policy Villages 2 provides the potential for development beyond the built up limits of the village (outside the Green Belt).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy Villages 3 does however, support the identification of suitable opportunities for small scale affordable housing schemes within or immediately adjacent to villages to meet specific, identified local housing needs that cannot be met through the development of sites allocated for housing development (i.e. rural exception sites) • Government guidance in the NPPF (paragraph 83) states that 'Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan'. This advice means that neighbourhood plans should not amend green belt boundaries nor allocate land for inappropriate development in the Green Belt. (eg including housing). • Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances (NPPF). • Whilst it is acknowledged that the approach in the current Plan has been amended from earlier versions in response to our discussions on this topic, we still have concerns that the Neighbourhood Plan is placing undue weight and detail on the acceptability of housing development on the Fir Tree Farm and Gallosbrook Way sites which are located within the Green Belt. As drafted the Neighbourhood Plan could be in conflict with the strategic policies in the adopted Cherwell Local Plan and is therefore at risk of failing to meet the Basic Conditions required of Neighbourhood Plans. 	<p>Noted</p> <p>Sites are deleted from NP</p>

	Organisation	Response	Action
		<p>The following comments are made in this context:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • P57: Second paragraph – delete ‘The provisional Site C (i) and (ii) are offered for development that would help to rebalance the housing density in the southern half of the village’. • Third paragraph – This paragraph can remain. • The principal aim of these comments is to ensure that these sites are not referred to in such a way that could be viewed as the sites being allocated for housing. • P58: Objectives • References to sites B and C should be deleted. • Housing Policies • You may wish to consider adding a new policy which addresses housing mix (see comments above regarding the Executive Summary). • The first paragraph referring to Southfield Farm could be made a standalone policy eg Policy H1. • Community Policies Policy • C4 (a) – For the avoidance of doubt it may be better to redraft as follows: ‘Development that endangers visual impact of the key views set out in this Plan and in Cherwell District Council’s Weston on the Green Conservation Area Appraisal 	<p>Done</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Note: Policy H2</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Policy: C5a</p>

	Organisation	Response	Action
		<p>(2009)'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transport Policies • Policy T2 – A threshold of 4 dwellings is included within this policy. There is no reason why this cannot be applied but the Plan will need to provide evidence/justification for this threshold. The views of Oxfordshire County Council as Highway Authority should also be sought on this policy. • Detailed references to village surveys and feedback – check that they have been referenced or included as background documents. • Table C – This may need updating as policy wording is amended. • Appendix A – It may be helpful to include <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Copies of the main publicity material eg posters, standard letters etc. • List of key points arising from the public meetings (i.e. a brief meeting note) • Details of landowners approached in the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan. • On a more general note this Appendix could be incorporated in to the wider Consultation Statement which will accompany your Submission Plan. (See comments on submission documents below). This will have to include details of the latest round of consultation on this Neighbourhood Plan in accordance with the Regulations. 	<p>Changed to 10 houses</p> <p>Note: App; E</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Included, now App B</p> <p>Note: App H</p> <p>See Consultation Statement</p> <p>Moved as suggested</p>

	Organisation	Response	Action
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appendix E – The Plan refers to this Design Code throughout. It is therefore integral to the implementation of the Plan’s policies. It is suggested therefore, that this appendix is given greater prominence. For example it could be moved up to Appendix A. • Appendix F – Given the earlier comments on the appropriateness of identifying Sites B and C as being suitable for housing within the Plan it is recommended that this appendix should be deleted. • • Appendix G – Please see comments above relating to Local Green Spaces. 	<p>Deleted</p> <p>Amended</p> <p>Moved to Appendix A</p> <p>Replaced with Site Brief and Environmental Statement – Area B – the Schoolfield</p> <p>Noted and changed</p>
3	English Heritage/Historic England	Congratulations on the exemplary approach to understanding the historic interest and character of the village and the succinct but informative way this is presented in the plan	Noted

	Organisation	Response	Action
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Policy H2: we are pleased to support the inclusion of a design code that is specific to the settlement and the conservation area •Policy C4: to protect the character of the village centre and inform master planning for any enhancements, such as the proposed village square, proposals should conserve the character of space, key street scenes and views within the village Development that would result in harm to the visual contribution of key views set out in this Plan and the Conservation Appraisal (2009) will not be supported. •Development proposals should show that design or development will conserve key features of local Character described and/or illustrated in Appendices E-J of this Plan and including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. views of high positive visual contribution, particularly of the Parish Church, the green and stocks, the Memorial roundabout at the village ce the wide verges on North Lane and the B430, the Manor frontage ii. the rural character engendered by all types of amenity green spaces, particularly the playing field, the spinney, the ponds 	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted and added to Chpt 5</p> <p>Community Policies C4</p> <p>Noted and strengthened In plan Policy C5</p>
2	Environmental Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Reminded 	
4	Highways England	Highways England have looked specifically at any potential to impact the safe and efficient operation of the strategic road network, in this case the A34 and the M40. They have no comments to make on this consultation	Noted

	Organisation	Response	Action
13	Historic England (SEA Consultation) 15.04.18	<p>“Weston-on-the-Green has a rich historic environment, with 33 listed buildings, a conservation area and potential archaeological interest. There is, therefore, potential for new development to have significant effects on the significance of heritage assets within the village, depending, of course, on where that development takes place.</p> <p>We note that the Plan identifies a need within the parish for 38 new dwellings during the Plan period but only allocates one site for development, for 20 dwellings. This site is adjacent to the Conservation Area and therefore has potential impacts on the special interest, character and appearance of the Area, or views into or out of the Area, that Policy C5 of the Plan seeks to protect. However, we understand that this site already has outline planning permission so we trust that these issues will have already been considered.</p> <p>The remaining 18 dwellings are to be met through an as yet unidentified site or sites. The Plan contains a number of policies that set out criteria that any new development should meet in order to be permitted. However, we note that none of these policies seek to conserve or enhance the heritage assets of the parish, with the exception of Policy C5, which only relates, as regards heritage assets, to views identified in the conservation area appraisal.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan therefore provides no specific protection to listed buildings or archaeological remains (and consequently we do not entirely agree with the statement in paragraph 25 of the Council’s draft Screening Opinion regarding the Draft Plan having policies intended to conserve or enhance the historic environment).</p> <p>Consequently, considering the Neighbourhood Plan in isolation, it does not appear to</p>	<p>We have re-emphasised this NP’s compliance under “Housing and Land Use”, pg 71,72 with the NPPF (pg 126-141) especially paragraphs 132 and 139 on the conservation or enhancement of all heritage assets of the village. This is also emphasised in ESD15 of the Local Plan, such that housing type should be appropriate to the local setting.</p> <p>There is the possibility of small housing sites in the half of the village that is on Green Belt. However, due to the current regulations on Green Belt development, we are unable to identify these sites. However, if some of the restrictions on Green Belt development are lifted, the Qualifying could recommend some small development close to</p>

	Organisation	Response	Action
		<p>limit the number of new houses that may be developed during the Plan period, it provides only a limited indication of where new development should not take place, and it does not provide any specific protection for listed buildings or archaeological remains and only very limited protection for the special interest, character and appearance of the conservation area.”</p>	<p>the centre of the village.</p> <p>Regarding listed buildings, Figure 9 identifies the 33 buildings in the village. We have amended H3 n page 71 to say:</p> <p>“ New development should place additional emphasis, in addition to the requirements outlined by the NPPF paragraphs 126-141 and especially paragraphs 132 and 139 on the conservation or enhancement of all heritage assets of the parish and ESD of the local Plan.” This is a clear statement that heritage assets are to be protected.</p>
1	Natural England	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • appreciate the policies to preserve dark skies and conserve and enhance green and open space • do: acknowledge designated site Weston Fen SSI & do not support development that would affect this area • require that all development results in a biodiversity net gain for the parish • Include: E2 “Inappropriate development of residential gardens 	Added to Chap 5.3 Policy E3

	Organisation	Response	Action
		<p>will not be supported where it will detract from the character of the village or has a negative impact on biodiversity”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adjust E2 regarding development on previously developed land • add a statement that new developments should incorporate large green verges • Objective TO2: add “where possible, Public Rights of Way should be enhanced by creating or upgrading link paths, improving maintenance, incorporating green infrastructure and signage through developer contributions” <p>Transport Policy T1: add “Parking areas and access routes related to new development should not result in a net loss to biodiversity or green space”.</p> <p>Site C is brownfield land. Note the NPPF Section 111 states that “planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-u and that has been previously developed”.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • issues on providing a green infrastructure and improving the natural environment are set out in a paper entitled: “Neighbourhood planning and the natural environment: information, issues and opportunities”. 	<p>Note: 5 Environment Policies E.1 Note Policies 1-E6</p> <p>E2 – how the Policy is delivered</p> <p>Added to Chap 5.3 Policy E2</p> <p>See Designated Local Green Spaces, Policy E6 See also Appendix G</p> <p>Noted and will request from Southfield Farm All to be included in Design Plan and Policy</p>

	Organisation	Response	Action
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Examples of how WOTG can enhance the above are : • Providing a new footpath with landscaping through the new development to link into existing rights of way or other green spaces. • Restoring a neglected hedgerow or creating new ones. • Creating a new pond as an attractive feature on site • Planting trees characteristic to the local area to make a positive contribution to the local landscape. • Using native plants in landscaping schemes for better nectar and seed sources for bees and birds. • Incorporating swift boxes or bat boxes into the design of new buildings • Considering how lighting can be best managed to encourage wildlife. • Adding a green roof or walls to new or existing buildings. For example by: • Setting out how you would like to implement elements of a wider Green Infrastructure Strategy in your community. • Assessing needs for accessible green space and setting out proposals to address any deficiencies or enhance provision. • Identifying green areas of particular importance for special protection through Local Green Space designation (see Planning Practice Guidance on this¹⁶). • Managing existing (and new) public spaces to be more wildlife friendly (e.g. by sowing wild flower strips in less used parts of parks, changing hedge cutting timings and frequency). 	<p>Added to Parish Council Action List</p>

	Organisation	Response	Action
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planting additional street trees. Identifying any improvements to the existing public right of way network, e.g. cutting back hedges, improving the surface, clearing litter or installing kissing gates) or extending the network to create missing links. Restoring neglected environmental features (e.g. coppicing a prominent hedge that is in poor condition or clearing away an eyesore). 	
10	Oxford Architectural & Historical Society	<p>4:1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Housing: should the option of building to the east of the B430 be examined in more depth. Clarity of NP's supporting argument is not there. Would a new development in this location with winding lanes with housing to increase the population not help assuage the traffic issue on the B430. <p>2.3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> neither the Weston Manor Hotel nor the village church are highlighted as having any role to play in the future provision of amenities hotel must be a source of employment, it does not supply its kitchens from its own garden churches are seeing themselves as centres of the community, and we would like to see some vision for its future 	<p>NP strengthened to show how the historic village is on one side of the road. vistas and open skies are on the other side.</p> <p>NP has requested responses but work needs to be done to develop relationships.</p>
12	Oxfordshire Butterfly Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> WOTG is surrounded by farmland some of which is arable, probably now you have little by way of permanent pasture or wildflower meadows, you do however have hedgerows and some small area's of woodland, so I would like to highlight Brown, White Letter and Black Hairstreak butterflies these are butterflies that are not 	<p>Importance of this is noted in 5.2 Theme 1, O1</p>

	Organisation	Response	Action
		<p>readily seen as they spend most of their lives in the canopy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •With the majority of the land in your region is in private ownership, we are not able to check these areas and we just do not have enough time to check everywhere. •The White Letter depends on Elm, the Dutch Elm disease has seriously reduced their numbers because they are dependent on the more mature flowering Elms or Wych Elm, if at any time planting trees is considered we would recommend planting disease resistant Elm. •I am fairly sure the Brown Hairstreak is in your region, (its distribution is monitored by looking for its eggs in the Winter) it lays its eggs on low Blackthorn growth usually no more than a meter and a half high, the modern use of the flail, is removing most of the eggs, this is one of the reasons that D.E.F.R.A recommends a three year rotation of hedge flailing. •The Black Hairstreak is the most restricted in its distribution, caterpillar food plant again is Blackthorn, Oxon and Bucks have at least 50% of this butterflies colonies, we have some old records from along Akeman street on your northern boundary, much of the Blackthorn has been removed, so we doubt that it still exists there, it was seen 2006 around Weston wood on your Southern boundary, it was also recorded at Tolbrook corner to the West in 2011, the Blackthorn has been cut back here as well. •Bletchingdon roadside, also seen here 2011, (some of these dates refer to when we last visited in the short flight period to look for them) if you have some good Blackthorn thickets in your area you may have well have this butterfly, so I have attached the management fact sheet produced by Butterfly Conservation. 	<p>Noted</p> <p>All of this info is Included in the Biodiversity Policy E2</p>

	Organisation	Response	Action
8	Oxfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group	<p>We would welcome a reflection within the Neighbourhood Plan that any impact from housing would have a corresponding impact on the practices ability to support their existing population.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Developer contributions should be considered to enable the local GP practice to grow. •transport to the surgery can be an issue •rural loneliness is a health factor •good digital connectivity can help support remote monitoring for house bound patients <p>The Oxford Clinical Commissioning Group has prepared a paper entitled “Health needs associated with housing growth” which details health needs associated with any housing development. This document should be referenced when considering housing Development.</p>	<p>We have written a new Social Services Policy for the NP See Chpt 5 Housing Policies H7</p> <p>Noted and used</p>
6	Oxfordshire County Council	<p>A key issue raised in the Transport Strategy response concerns the plan’s objective to restore a Public Transport service to the village; whilst this objective is supported it is not clear how it could be achieved. Without a public transport service there are issues with the sustainability of small scale development.</p> <p>Transport comments:</p>	<p>Understood but not helpful without funds. Concerned that the County does not help our village to be sustainable.</p>

	Organisation	Response	Action
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • there are no funds available for a bus service • WOTG does not have the critical mass to support a bus service for commuters (fee-paying customers) • permitting any small-scale residential development at WOTG would result in a population without means of transport. An increase in car use would add to congestion on the approaches to Oxford and Bicester. <p>Travel Plans</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is recommended that reference is made to the requirement for travel plans and travel plan statements as set out in Oxfordshire County council guidance document Transport for new development, Transport assessment and travel plans (2014) • there is support in principle for improving walking links within the village and looking to expand and connect up the cycling links , including the employment site. Funding would need to be secured. • bus service are unlikely but there are other options such as community lift share schemes to be explored. <p>Road Safety Aspirations A20, A21.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the road (B430) is considered as having a reasonable speed limit (2011 and 2013 review) 	<p>“Catch 22”</p> <p>Action on Parish Council to determine If there is a need for a commuter bus</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>To be explored</p> <p>Disagree and note 30 mph in Middleton Stoney. A count on any</p>

	Organisation	Response	Action
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • changes to 30 mph could happen, but only after traffic calming measures are in place. There is no funding for this. <p>Aspiration A22 “speed limit on the lanes radiating from the B430 should be reduces to 20 mph”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • it is likely these roads would meet the DY guidelines for a 20 mph speed limit • it would be subject to statutory consultation • there are no funds for any traffic calming measures <p>Aspiration A23 “the weight restriction for heavy lorries should include both directions”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • not appropriate to have a limit as this is a diversion route for the A34 <p>Aspiration 25 “pedestrian crossing need on B430”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • no funding for such a project although there is not a problem with this • Zebra crossings are only for a 30 mph zone • a pedestrian refuge does not require a consultation • a signalled crossing does require a consultation 	<p>day of the number of cars trying to safely enter the B430 would reveal how unsafe ingress is at 40 mph.</p> <p>To be arranged</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Rather than used as a diversion route, it is currently the preferred route for many lorries. This is not an A route and as such should only be used when an actual diversion is necessary.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Still unsafe on B430</p>

	Organisation	Response	Action
		<p>Public Rights of Way</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the plan’s Transport and Development policies for protecting and enhancing public rights of way/countryside access are supported <p>Economy and Skills</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> we support the WOTG NP in the context of the objectives and policies as being aligned with the Strategic Economy Plan’s priorities for People, Place, Enterprise and Connectivity <p>Education</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> pg 61 comments on providing a pre-school: there is advice that the county council can provide. See notes for details. pg 96 comments on recent availability of school places in the surrounding area. Note: Chesterton Primary School has been approved for expansion and the recent expansion of Bletchingdon School has also increased school capacity <p>Minerals and Waste/Waster Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> no comments <p>Green Infrastructure</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Given the number of houses being built in both villages there is still concern regarding school places.</p>

	Organisation	Response	Action
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the detail and thought that has gone into understanding and explaining the landscape character of the parish is welcomed (refer to the recently published county Historic Landscape Characterisation project, available on the county council website, may be of value) *** • the policies relating to the control of light pollution are supported • there is an opportunity to complement the landscape character input with additional information and policy on biodiversity. • Protection and enhancement of biodiversity is a core part of the NPPF and the district council’s Local Plan Part 1 • Background Evidence: Figure 5 includes reference to Conservation Target Areas (CTA). It would be helpful to include Otmoor CTA to the south-east on Figure 5. • There are two Local Wildlife Sites identified within the parish (both woodlands south of the A34), which are also recorded as Ancient Woodland, the status of which it would also be appropriate to record on Figure 5. • There is little reference to the plants and animals within and around the settlement, which depend upon the trees, hedges, grasslands, and water bodies that give form to the green spaces. Existing information held by the Thames Valley Environmental Records Centre shows a number of protected and notable species including species of bats and swifts. Local information would easily swell this list. • Policy: In terms of policy it would be helpful if the NP could reinforce and interpret existing biodiversity policy within the district’s Local Plan Part 1, in particular ensuring that a “net gain” in biodiversity is sought where possible and stating this in policies and supporting information. • The parish has one CTA within its boundary, Kirtlington and Bletchingdon Park and 	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted, very helpful</p> <p>Note: Policy E1, E2</p> <p>Added</p> <p>Added</p>

	Organisation	Response	Action
		<p>Woods, and abuts Otmoor CTA to the south-east. As such the parish plays an important role in linking the two CTA. The NP could help in this process by identifying areas of locally important habitat and considering whether there are opportunities to strengthen wildlife corridors.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There may also be opportunities to reinforce wildlife conservation at a very local level, for example by reinforcing the need to protect the roosts of bats and nests of declining birds such as swifts that often depend upon old houses and can be lost in renovations and re-builds; and can be incorporated into new developments. 	<p>Note: 5.2 Theme 1 Policy E.2</p> <p>Note: Policy E1</p> <p>Note : Policy E.2</p>
11	Oxfordshire Playing Fields Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OPFA fully supports the policies of the plan designed to ensure that the playing field and other green spaces are not lost to development, in particular Plan Policy C4 • Objective A17 “to improve the existing playground and consider the designation of a new recreation space” - this is fully supported and would be willing to work with WOTG on this • regarding the aim to protect the remaining green spaces: • recommend getting in touch with Fields in Trust as they work with landowners to protect open spaces in perpetuity. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • see website http://www.fieldsintrust.org/ 	<p>Note: 5.2 Theme: Community and Economy Policy C1</p>
9	Scottish and Southern Electricity Networks	<p>No specific comments on this NP</p> <p>Background info: Letters to Cherwell District Council from Sept 8/14 with attachment w has info on main power line running through WOTG and essential to the area.</p>	<p>Noted</p>

	Organisation	Response	Action
7	Thames Water	<p>Thames Water do not have concerns with regards to the level of Development proposed in and around WOTG area. However, as the local Sewage Treatment Works is very small, Thames would like to encourage developers and the Council to consult Thames on any proposed development as soon as possible.</p> <p>General Comments:</p> <p>New development should be co-ordinated with the infrastructure it demands and to take into account the capacity of existing Infrastructure Paragraph 156 of the NPPF March 2012, states; <i>“Local planning authorities should set out strategic policies for the area in the Local Plan. This should include strategic policies to deliver.....the provision of infrastructure for water supply and wastewater.....”</i></p> <p>Paragraph 162 of the NPPF relates to infrastructure and states: <i>“Local planning authorities should work with other authorities to: assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure for water supply and wastewater and its treatment.....take account of the need for strategic infrastructure including nationally significant infrastructure within their areas”</i>. Local Plans should be the focus for ensuring that investment plans of water and sewerage/waste-water companies align with development needs.</p>	<p>Note: 5.2, Theme 2: Housing & Land Use policy H4 and App A: Design Code</p> <p>Policy `H4 and Design Code: App A</p> <p>Written and inserted</p> <p>Note: Policy H4</p> <p>Noted</p>

	Organisation	Response	Action
		<p><i>“Adequate water and wastewater infrastructure is needed to support sustainable development (Paragraph: 001, Reference ID: 343-001-20140306”</i></p> <p>In light of this there is an omission of a Policy on Water and Infrastructure.</p> <p>Thames Water should be consulted regarding proposals involving Building over or close to a public sewer. Is such building is agreed This will need to be regulated by an Agreement in order to protect The public sewer or apparatus in question.</p> <p>Or</p> <p>In a section on ‘infrastructure and Utilities’ a statement similar to that set out below:</p> <p><i>As per policy INF1(Infrastructure) of the Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 Part 1, Developers need to consider the net increase in water and waster water demand to serve their developments and also any impact the developments may have off site further down the network, if no\low water pressure and internal/eternal sewage flooding of property to be avoided.</i></p>	Policy H4
14	The Environment Agency	<p>“We regret that at present, the Thames Area Sustainable Places team is unable to review this consultation. This is due to resourcing issues within the team, a high development management workload and an increasing volume of neighbourhood</p>	Noted

	Organisation	Response	Action
	(SEA consultation) 3.03.18	<p>planning consultations. We have had to prioritise our limited resource, and must focus on influencing plans where the environmental risks and opportunities are highest. For the purposes of neighbourhood planning, we have assessed those authorities that have “up to date” local plans (plans adopted since 2012, or which have been confirmed as being compliant with the National Planning Policy Framework) as being of lower risk. At this time, therefore, we are unable to make any detailed input on neighbourhood plans being prepared within this local authority area.</p> <p>However, together with Natural England, English Heritage and Forestry Commission, we have published joint guidance on neighbourhood planning, which sets out sources of environmental information and ideas on incorporating the environment into plans. This is available at: http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20140328084622/http://cdn.environment-agency.gov.uk/LIT_6524_7da381.pdf “</p>	

APPENDIX H: MEETINGS WITH CHERWELL DISTRICT COUNCIL

Following are the noted meetings with Cherwell District Council. A number of emails are on file asking for further information.

14.06.2016	Christina Cherry CDC	Site visit at Fir Tree Farm near the centre of the village of WOTG. Purpose: to discuss possible housing development on the site. It is green belt land and is currently an eye sore for the villagers resident on either side. It is the site most favourable with the village.
05.07.2016	Meeting with David Peckford and Christina Cherry of CDC and Diane Bohm, Roger Evans of the NP Steering Committee	Purpose: to discuss and progress issues relating to the WOTG Neighbourhood Plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Objectives vs Policies 2. Compliance statement 3. Fir Tree Farm issue 4. Sustainability Appraisal
01.11.2016	Officer Observations on the WOTG Neighbourhood Plan	The officers of CDC forwarded a comprehensive document on all aspects of the pre document. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Key points: 2. Issue of Fir Tree Farm being in the Green Belt. 3. Green Spaces 4. Specific policy adjustments 5. Policies that could be included 6. Design Code
26.06.2017	Officer comments on pre-submission plan for WOTG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A comprehensive review the NP team on our revisions to the plan. This included: 2. Planning Practice advice 3. Mapping/diagrams 4. Housing Policies 5. Local Green Spaces 6. Transport Policies 7. Next stages
9.10.2017	Christina Cherry of CDC , Susan Davis and Roger Evans	Discussion of a specific request for a local green space

18.10.2017	SEA Screening	
02.06.2017	Maria Dopazo, CDC Mike Finbow WOTG NP	The meeting was to discuss the SEA screening format and our consultation with Natural England, Historic England and the Environment Agency. Also discussed was how best to describe proposed housing sites, considering the Green Belt issue. It was agreed that the SEA would begin to be drafted by CDC.
08.11.2017	Maria Dopazo, CDC Mike Finbow, WOTG NP	The meeting was to discuss the SEA Screening requirements and to begin gathering information for CDC to carry out the SEA, having regard to the comments from Natural England, Historic England and the Environment Agency and the 16 th October 2017 edition of the NP.
01/12.2017	Maria Dopazo, CDC Mike Finbow, WOTG NP	Maria emailed her draft Screening Opinion that highlighted a potential problem in the anticipated use of the Schoolfield, which prevented her from stating that a full SEA Assessment would not be necessary. Maria recommended that we liaise with Julie Kerans of the Thames Valley Environmental Records Centre to help us resolve the problem. This we did.
16.02.2018	Maria Dopazo, CDC Mike Finbow, WOTG NP	MF sent a new version of the NP and its Appendices to CDC.
24.02.2018	Maria Dopazo, CDC Mike Finbow, WOTG NP	Maria sent a revised Screening Opinion Historic England, The Environment Agency and Natural England were consulted regarding the draft SEA. Their responses are found on pages 63 -66 with the actions that ensued
	Other meetings	
8.08.2016	Stewart Howden CDC, Diane Bohm NP, John Miller, landowner	To discuss Fir Tree Farm as a site for the NP
y19.06.2017	Matthew Parry CDC, Diane Bohm NP, John Miller, landowner	To discuss Fir Tree Farm as a site for the NP
15.07.2016	Rep from Duchy of Cornwall	To discuss the further development of the

		Gallosbrooke Way site for Affordable Housing.
28.05.2015	OCC Highways, Anthony Kirkwood, Diane Bohm WOTG, Roger Evans WOTG	To discuss the traffic issue through the village and possible solutions. Key issue: no funding
10.09/2016	Diane Bohm and residents	Street meeting for Gallosbrooke Way
13.09/2016	Diane Bohm, Roger Evans, Patsy Parsons	Street meeting for Knowle Lane
09/2017	Neil Mullane, Chair of Traffic Advisory Group	Street meeting for Church Lane/Road, Church Close

APPENDIX I CONSULTATION OVER AMENDMENT TO DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN REGARDING THE SCHOOLFIELD

Once the team decided to amend our housing and land policy we realised further consultation would need to occur.

We did the following:

- updated the NP website on a regular basis with an explanation of changes in the plan
- emailed our extensive village mailing list with the above explanation on two more occasions
- explained changes at two village meetings both of which has very high turnouts (August 3rd, 2017 and January 24th, 2018)
- updated the village bimonthly through the Village News
- checked with Natural England, Historic England, the Environment Agency and took their advice
- regular meetings with CDC

July 2018