

Regulation 16 Representations – Adderbury Neighbourhood Submission Plan

No	Representation	Summary
1	Natural England	ANP proposals do not have the capacity to impact on statutory designated sites, and that the Local Nature Reserve has been allocated as a Local Green Space, which will enhance its protection. Policies relating to Biodiversity Net Gain should propose the use of a biodiversity measure for development proposals (Annex A – examples of calculation methods)
2	Six local residents Ian Ashbury, Colin Astley, Stephen Betts, Penny Clarke, Ian Jelfs, and Tony Gill	Page3 Para4 – focus on land based policies is not considered consistent with the national and local guidance. Emphasis should be on sustainable development. Neighbourhood Plan area – does not acknowledge the recent findings of pre-historic Neolithic/ Bronze age features. Page 11 sec 3.2 - Good design Page 12 sec 3.6 – Support for village shop is needed Page 16 – Vision and objectives are questioned Page 17 and 18– Policy AD1 – appeal on land west of Horn Hill Road – breach pf a key component of the plan Page 32 – Policy AD17 – Archaeology and evidence of Pre-Historic settlements to examine Page 33 – floodlighting of the sports ground should be resisted Page 35 – policy supports commercial premises, but does little to address the general food shop Page 38 – Infrastructure projects – disagree on land for use as a cemetery – Blue Book info provided
3	Mr H R N Stilgoe	New Primary School not identified in the Plan The farming community are affected, but not always consulted Timescales didn't allow the plan to reflect current day conditions. Questions and answers were ambiguous. AD1 - Opposes settlement boundary because there is no room for a new primary school AD4 - Opposes to the Adderbury Fields Estate Open Space because it is arable land. Open Space and Footpath incorrectly marked on Maps showing Green Infrastructure – AD2 and AD4. Mr Stilgoe's land is included in AD2 and the footpath on his land is shown incorrectly. (Plans submitted with the representation)
4	Valerie Russell, Clerk, Bodicote Parish Council	Twyford Local Gaps – supported. Important for the prevention of coalescence between Bodicote and Adderbury.
5	Cherwell District Council	Discussed in detail in the Schedule of Changes. Notes of meeting dated 8/12/17 are attached.
6	John Craven	AD10 – backland and tandem development is considered of particular significance in the conservation area and suggest

		that the policy is amended to include backland and tandem development within the policy.
7	Oxfordshire County Council	<p>Support in principle. OCC's previous advice has not been taken into account by the ANP and suggests that it would be covered in future Parish Plan, which is considered as a missed opportunity. The issues are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainable rural and built environment • Other infrastructure • Transport • The resources, facilities and services • Education • Local employment and small-scale local businesses • Wildlife habitat and protection <p>Transport identified as an issue did not progress to policy. Improvements and managing traffic through Adderbury should be considered</p> <p>AD2 – list of suggested schemes to be delivered by developers or developer contributions required would be helpful</p> <p>AD5 – has potential to restrict highway improvements on the A4260. Highway improvements should be excluded from this policy.</p> <p>AD6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 14, 15, 16 – The Highway Authority has rights over the highway and roadside verges. These policies may conflict with this.</p> <p>AD12 – prevents developers from providing appropriate access to the site</p> <p>AD14 – It may affect the possibility of road widening along A4260 strategic corridor and B4100.</p> <p>AD16 – retention of verges – conflict – The requirement to retain or re-provide highway verges should be removed.</p> <p>AD18 – Access will be considered by Highways Authority.</p> <p>AD21- needs more detail, it is not clear what these projects will entail and how they will be implemented. No schemes have been identified.</p> <p>Education – an additional half form of primary school capacity</p> <p>Archaeology – no mention of heritage assets of archaeological interest.</p> <p>Public Health – safe and secure street layouts would minimise the conflict between traffic and pedestrians. Policies for new development must be able to support health and wellbeing would be helpful. Suggest that projects to improve pedestrian safety and improvement of connectivity are included in AD21 and Infrastructure Projects.</p> <p>Ecology- AD2 is supported</p>
8	Framptons Town Planning	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. AD1 – Oppose. Include proposed site within the settlement boundary – Map No: PF/9614 2. AD1 – Oppose. Include proposed site within the settlement boundary – Map No: PF/9920

9	Rosconn Strategic Land	AD1 – Oppose – too restrictive and at odds with the NPPF AD2 – oppose – modify by deletion of reference to footpaths, bridleways and cycleways AD5 – oppose – delete policy
10	Gladman Developments Limited	AD1 – delete – too restrictive AD5 – delete – a strategic policy beyond the remit of neighbourhood plans AD6 – too restrictive- suggest a more flexible approach AD17 – non consistent with para 135 of the NPPF. Modify policy to accord with the NPPF regarding non-designated heritage assets.
11	Richard Davis	Support the Plan – modify policies to maintain and preserve the distinctiveness of the village Objective 5.2 – insert ‘however, such infill excludes back land and tandem development which will not be supported’. AD8 – ‘Proposals promoting back land and tandem development will not be permitted as this will have a detrimental effect on the pastoral landscape of the Manors character area’. Para 4.7 – bullet point 2 – such a statement should be qualified by the statement made in para 3.8.
12	Church Commissioners	Site shown on Map – Enclosure 1 is for employment use within Banbury Business Park. Objects to the inclusion of the site within Policy AD2 – suggest removal of the site from AD2. It is a site allocation for B1/B2 use ion the Saved Local Plan 1996.
13	Stephanie Lea	Objective 5.2 – Insert ‘However, such infill excludes back land and tandem development which will not be supported’. AD8 – add ‘back land and tandem development will not be permitted as this will have a detrimental effect on the pastoral landscape’.
14	Thames Water	Support para 3.4. Developers need to consider the net increase in waste water demand to serve their development. Suggest recommends that developers engage with Thames Water at the earliest opportunity to establish the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The developments demand for water supply and network infrastructure both on and off site and can it be met. • The developments demand for Sewage Treatment and network infrastructure both on and off site and can it be met. • The surface water drainage requirements and flood risk of the development both on and off site and can it be met. Policy INF1 – Developers need to consider net increase in water and waste water demand to serve their developments and any impacts off site.
15	Kevin and Debbie Russell	Objective 5.2- suggest amendment, ‘to deter the

		<p>detrimental effect of back land and tandem development on the pastoral landscape’.</p> <p>Objective 5.5 – suggest amendment, ‘threat to heritage and conservation etc.’</p> <p>Objective 5.11 – suggest amendment, ‘back land and tandem development detrimental to the pastoral landscape’.</p> <p>AD2 – suggest adding ‘private land of special landscape/conservation value to residents.</p> <p>AD10 – suggest adding, (vii) proposals promoting back land and tandem development will not be permitted as this will have a detrimental effect on the pastoral landscape of The Lanes character area.</p> <p>Para 5.34- suggest amendment, ‘back land and tandem development which will be deemed detrimental to the pastoral landscape.</p>
16	NHS OCCG	<p>There is no mention of health in the Plan. Amend Plan to acknowledge that GP practices is close to capacity in North Oxfordshire; therefore housing development will have direct impact on the local health service. Appropriate financial developer contribution financial or in kind with the support of the Parish and District Councils would be required.</p> <p>Suggest adding, ‘The neighbourhood will not normally support significant housing developments or further development of extra care housing (C2) without contributions to developing sufficient primary medical health care provision’.</p> <p>Policy Ad19 – add Gracewell Nursing Home to the list</p> <p>AD21 – add, ‘Growth of primary health care in proportion to new residential development’ to the list of priority projects for investment.</p>
17	Marcus Chandler	<p>AD8 – suggest amendment to include, ‘Proposals promoting backland and tandem development will not be permitted’ within the policy.</p> <p>Objectives paragraph 5.5 - Add ‘threat to heritage and conservation’ after design, access.</p>
18	David Thorpe, Brown and Co (Landowner – Croft Lane)	<p>Footpaths north of Chapel Lane are included in Policy AD2. These are in private ownership with no access rights and in agricultural use. All public footpaths, bridleways, and cycle routes are protected under legislation and as such it is unnecessary for Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan to include policies dealing with such routes; therefore deleted from the Policy and Policy Maps.</p>
19	Environment Agency	<p>Environment Agency can provide information to Neighbourhood Plans when developing site specific policies</p>
20	Historic England	<p>Welcome the description of the historical development of the parish and reference to designated heritage assets para 2.1 – 2.7. Welcome conservation areas paras 3.7-3.8.</p> <p>AD17 – Supported. Suggest, reference is made to the list of locally-important buildings and features in AD17. Consult</p>

		<p>Oxfordshire Historic Environment Record and Historic Landscape Character Assessment.</p> <p>Suggest including sites of archaeological interest to guide decisions.</p> <p>Vision- Suggest, “conserve <u>and enhance</u> the special heritage character....”</p> <p>AD21 – Support</p> <p>Commend the Plan to the Examiner for producing concise and clearly worded policies. It is an exemplar in our view in the use of policies relating to character.</p>
21	Highways England	No comments
22	Alan Plumb, Milton Parish Meeting	No response
23	National Grid	Please consult National Grid on site specific proposals that affect our infrastructure
24	Sport England	<p>Neighbourhood Plans should reflect and comply with paras 73 and 74 of the NPPF.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To protect playing fields, • Assessment of need and strategies for indoor and outdoor sports facilities. <p>Neighbourhood Plan groups should look to see if the local authority has a playing pitch strategy or other indoor/outdoor sports facility strategy as evidence base for their plans.</p> <p>Any new housing developments will generate additional demand for sport. Sport England’s Active Design guidance can help with planning policies or proposals.</p>
25	Network Rail	Note- Traffic over a level crossing can be vehicular, pedestrian, cyclists or horse-riders and that proposals do not have to be adjacent to a level crossing to potentially impact the crossing.
26	Scottish and Southern Electric	No comments.

Full representations are available on the Council’s website, please see link below.

<https://www.cherwell.gov.uk/info/221/neighbourhood-plans/393/adderbury-neighbourhood-plan/3>