

## **Pyrton Neighbourhood Plan 2018 - 2033**

### **Consultation Statement, para 4.21 - table of actions taken on responses to draft plan**

Commenting body	Summarised comment on draft PNP	Action taken in response	Relevant para (s) in PNP (and/or supporting documents)
<p>South Oxfordshire District Council</p>	<p><u>Housing Need:</u> It is important that housing need evidence is robust and the approach and choices made in the plan well justified. The PNP presents a conflicting message about the findings of the Housing Need Survey (HNS). The survey did not identify a need but identified local support for the provision of a limited amount of housing. Compounding this conflict, at times, the PNP indicates that site allocations will meet the parish needs – if this is the case, the plan should be clear about what the identified needs are. Other times, the plan suggests the allocation will meet the future needs – the plan and the HNS are not clear on how the future needs have been calculated.</p> <p>If the intention of the Plan is to identify capacity and contribute towards meeting the overall housing need in the District, the narrative and justifications in the plan should be clarified.</p> <p>Finally, the Plan indicates that semi-detached market and affordable houses as the most suitable option. However, it is not clear how this has been assessed and whether it has regard to the latest and up-to-date evidence of housing need set out in the SHMA 2014.</p> <p><u>Basic Conditions Statement:</u> The Basic Conditions Statement identifies that the site allocations contribute towards delivering a wide choice of homes. However, the Plan suggests a preference for unit sizes similar to existing properties.</p> <p><u>PYR1:</u> The Sustainability Appraisal identifies that the site is close to facilities in Watlington but there is no indication that these are accessible.</p> <p>The sustainability of the location and of the proposed development should be a key consideration. You should also consider the potential impact of the loss of employment opportunities on this site.</p>	<p>Text in PNP and supporting documents have been amended to show that new housing represents a parish contribution to wider district housing needs, not a response to current or likely future parish housing requirements.</p> <p>Done.</p> <p>The PPC recognises the analysis of district housing need in the SHMA 2014. The preference for semi-detached houses (market and affordable) is based on the unsuitability of terraced housing within a rural village, the core of which lies within a Conservation Area. SA1 (see below) looks for a mix of housing, including affordable housing, but landscape and contextual constraints restrict potential density.</p> <p>The PNP envisages semi-detached houses, of which there are currently few in the core village. <i>Policy SA1: Former MoD site</i> seeks affordable housing, if viable, i.e. a mix of units (see under SA1 below).</p> <p>See under SA1 below.</p> <p>See under SA1 below.</p>	<p>See, e.g., para 5.2.8 of PNP.</p> <p>Para 6.2.5.1.</p>

	<p><b>PYR2:</b> Opposition to any built development on this site: use of such negative language is inappropriate and may conflict with national policy and guidance.</p> <p>The PNP should focus on building a robust evidence base and justification of the exceptional value of the area as a Local Green Space Designation (LGSD), and how it should be managed thereafter.</p> <p>It is not clear how references in the PNP relating to preventing coalescence between Pyrton and Watlington (page 12) relate to the LGSD criteria in the NPPF.</p> <p><b>General 1:</b> All proposed site allocations for residential development set out a density much lower than the minimum 25 dwellings per hectare required by Policy CSH2 from the adopted Core Strategy.</p> <p>Policy CSH2 aims to promote sustainable development by promoting the efficient use of land and to meet needs for smaller and more affordable homes, particularly where there are good public transport links. The minimum density of 25 dwellings per hectare is designed to give more flexibility in sensitive locations such as village locations. Higher densities can be justified where there is access to frequent public transport services and a wide range of services and facilities, but it should not compromise living standards. New housing should provide good quality, attractive and acceptable living environments. This policy should be read in conjunction with Policy CSQ3 Design.</p> <p>If you consider the minimum density required by Policy CSH2 to be inappropriate, it is important that you develop a robust evidence base justifying how this would have an adverse effect on the character of the area.</p> <p><b>General 2:</b> A route for the Watlington bypass is proposed to be safeguarded by the emerging South Oxfordshire District Council Local Plan 2033. In order to ensure conformity with National Planning Practice Guidance, it is important that we produce complementary local plans and neighbourhood plans. Neighbourhood plans should support the strategic development needs set out in the Local Plan and plan positively to support local development.</p> <p>It is important that you consider how the safeguarded route may interact with the proposals in your plans. There may be opportunities for your allocation in PYR1 to contribute towards the delivery of the safeguarded route.</p> <p><b>General 3:</b> The Plan often talks about protection and conservation, without much regard for enhancing</p>	<p>The LGSD has been replaced for PYR2 by designation as a 'local gap' (<i>BNE4</i>).</p> <p>Done. Evidence base includes new Landscape and Green Space Study.</p> <p>The criteria for a 'local gap', as against those for LGSD, are explained in <i>BNE4: Local Gap</i> supporting text.</p> <p>Current village housing density is outlined and explained in revised text. There is now just one site allocation outstanding (the former MoD site, PYR1), which is subject to landscape and contextual constraint (see under <i>SA1</i> below)</p> <p>Revised text, see under <i>SA1</i> below, relying on SODC's Landscape Capacity Assessment Report, 2015.</p> <p>The safeguarding for the Watlington bypass is noted in the PNP but, in the absence of a policy or a plan for it, the PNP does not cater for it directly. The <i>BNE4: Local Gap</i> designation is not inconsistent with the safeguarding of a route for an appropriate bypass.</p> <p>SODC's safeguarded route does not affect PYR1 directly.</p> <p>Terminology changed throughout PNP to</p>	<p>Paras 6.2.5.2.6-11 and PNP supporting document, <i>Landscape and Green Space Study</i>, sections 6.1-6.2.</p> <p>Para 6.2.5.2.4.</p> <p>Para 5.2.8.4.</p> <p>Para 6.2.5.2.12.</p> <p>PNP <i>passim</i>.</p>
--	---	---	--

	<p>the area.</p> <p>The PNP tackles various issues that NPs have little influence over. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Safeguarding Pyrton from adverse levels of through traffic.</li> <li>· Lack of restrictions on heavy goods vehicles</li> <li>· Mobile reception and broadband speeds</li> </ul> <p><u>General 4:</u> The policies should be clearly distinguishable from supporting text. Page 41</p> <p><u>General 5:</u> A number policies use imprecise language i.e. 'parishioners will support'.</p> <p><u>BNE1 [now BNE2]:</u> It is not clear what this policy is adding to existing national and local policies and how it responds to the unique characteristics of Pyrton. Your neighbourhood plan should address gaps or provide further detail rather than duplicating existing policies.</p> <p>It is important to note that the South Oxfordshire Landscape Character Assessment is currently being updated.</p> <p><u>BNE2 [now BNE1]:</u> Whilst locally distinctive, it is unclear what this policy is adding to existing national and local policies. The justification to the policy should be based on robust evidence as well as public engagement.</p> <p><u>BNE3:</u> Local green spaces Based on feedback from NP examiners, each proposed LGSD should be identified on an individual map of an appropriate scale.</p> <p><u>BNE4 [now BNE5]:</u> It is not clear what value the first part of this policy is adding to existing national and local policies or how it responds to the unique characteristics of Pyrton. The second part of the policy however, is locally distinctive and perhaps necessary as the area is not served by mains waste water.</p> <p><u>BNE5 [now BNE6]:</u> Policies should target development rather than landowners/developers. Feedback from NP examiners indicate that such policies should be worded "should" rather than "must" to allow a degree of flexibility.</p> <p><u>C1:</u> Consultation requirements are set out in statute and may be beyond the remit of NPs. Furthermore, the proposed requirements lack the clarity required by national planning practice guidance in order to conform with basic conditions.</p> <p><u>C2 [now C1]:</u> As worded Policy C2 is overly restrictive and has no regard to viability.</p> <p>It is important to note that the Assets of</p>	<p>reflect this.</p> <p>Noted. These topics have been deleted from the PNP and included, where relevant, in the PPC action plan.</p> <p>Changes made.</p> <p>Changes made to individual policies.</p> <p><i>Policy BNE2: Landscape character</i> amended.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p><i>Policy BNE1: Historic Environment</i> amended. Evidence supplied. <i>Draft Conservation Area Appraisal</i> submitted to SODC in October 2017.</p> <p>Figs 19 and 20 identify the two LGSDs.</p> <p><i>Policy BNE5: Flood risk and drainage</i> amended.</p> <p><i>BNE6: Footpaths and bridleways</i> amended.</p> <p>Policy deleted.</p> <p>Wording recommended by SODC adopted and included.</p>	<p>Para 7.2.</p> <p>Para 6.2.3.1.</p> <p>Paras 6.2.2.1. and 6.2.2.2.</p> <p>Paras 6.2.4.2.1 and 6.2.4.2.2.</p> <p>Para 6.2.6.1.</p> <p>Para 6.2.7.1.</p> <p>Para 6.3.1.1.1. and 6.3.1.1.2.</p>
--	--	---	--

	<p>Community Value legislation ensures that community groups have a chance to bid for designated assets. Neighbourhood planning policies can inform how designated assets should be managed by the planning system.</p> <p>TT1: It is not clear what this policy is adding to existing national and local policies and how it responds to the unique characteristics of Pyrton.</p> <p>TT12: The issues dealt with in this policy are largely outside the remit of neighbourhood plans. Examiners normally recommend such policies to be turned into actions that the Parish Council can follow up with the relevant authorities.</p> <p>7.6.1 This section refers to 'local demand' however it is not clear whether this relates to the neighbourhood area or the wider district.</p> <p>It is also not clear whether the suggestion that 'no more than three dwellings will be located in the core village' is backed by local consultation or the result of your consideration of reasonable alternatives.</p> <p>Overall, this summary appears overly negative and inconsistent with positive stance of your neighbourhood plan towards housing development.</p> <p>7.6.3.2 supporting text. NP planning policies should be supported by robust evidence. The supporting text refers to an anecdotal understanding of the potential housing need for the parish.</p> <p><u>H2:</u> This policy states that new residential development should predominantly comprise detached or semi-detached houses.</p> <p>It is not clear how this requirement relates to an identified need, i.e. SHMAA or the Pyrton Housing Need Survey.</p> <p>In addition, please see comments in row 2 and 6, relating potential issues of conformity with the NPPF's intent to deliver a wide choice of homes and potential issues of conformity with Policy CSH2 of the Core Strategy.</p> <p><u>D1 and supporting text:</u> Please see comment in row 10.</p> <p>NPs should be read as a whole therefore the use of 'subject to compliance with all other PNP policies, and the identified site allocations' is unnecessary.</p> <p>Criterion a is overly restrictive and not backed by robust evidence.</p> <p>In relation to criteria b and c, terms such as</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Policy deleted.</p> <p>Policy deleted. Traffic is now a matter for PPC action under the action plan.</p> <p>Clarified in text</p> <p>Now overtaken by SODC planning consents for the two relevant sites.</p> <p>Text changed.</p> <p>Text changed.</p> <p>Noted. The SHMA 2014 shows a demand and requirement for a mix of housing, but terraced housing is unlikely to be appropriate within a rural village, the core of which lies within the Conservation Area. Hence the use of term 'predominantly'. SA1 (see below) looks for a mix of housing, including affordable housing, but landscape and contextual constraints restrict potential density.</p> <p>Wording changed.</p> <p>Phrase deleted.</p> <p>Amended.</p> <p><i>Policy D1: Detailed design criteria</i> text made</p>	<p>Para 7.2.5.</p> <p>Para 6.4.2.2.1.</p> <p>Para 6.4.2.2.</p> <p>Para 6.4.2.2.</p> <p>Para 6.5.2.1.2a.</p> <p>Para 6.5.2.1.2b.</p> <p>Para 6.5.2.2.3.</p>
--	---	---	--

	<p>'character' and 'traditional architectural style' are frequently used to describe the distinctive look and feel of an area which needs to be protected but it does little in itself to explain what this is.</p> <p>Criterion d requires the provision of generous plot and garden sizes. This requirement may conflict with Policy CSH2 of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Criterion e requires the provision of off street parking and garages. It is not clear whether both are expected to be provided in all circumstances. If so, this requirement could be deemed unduly onerous.</p> <p>Paragraph 2 of the supporting text (7.7.3.2) states that 'any new residential development must, in general, accord...' The use of 'must' is only appropriate where you are sure that the requirements of the policy are compulsory in all circumstances.</p> <p><u>Policies D2 and D3:</u> Please see comment in row 10.</p> <p>NPs should be read as a whole therefore the use of 'subject to compliance with all other PNP policies, and the identified site allocations' is unnecessary.</p> <p>Criteria a from policy D2 and b from Policy D3 appear to take a less robust approach than the saved policies in the Local Plan (2011) in relation to protecting residential amenity.</p> <p><u>SA1:</u> Please see comments in rows 1, 2, 3, 5 and 6.</p>	<p>more specific: viz. designs that are generally influenced by the Chiltern vernacular architectural style featuring brick, flint and tiles, and local conditions. Supporting text refers to Chilterns Building Design Guide, 2010.</p> <p>Modified to include communal areas or new public green space,</p> <p>Criterion deleted.</p> <p>Wording changed.</p> <p>Wording changed.</p> <p>Phrase deleted.</p> <p>Suggested SODC wording adopted from 2011 Local Plan.</p> <p>Amendments made.</p> <p>Sustainability: supporting text to <i>Policy SA1: Former MoD site</i> notes that the site benefits from pavement linkages to services and facilities in Watlington, in reasonable proximity to the site. It is therefore in a sustainable location, although any development is likely to lead to additional local traffic.</p> <p>Housing type: affordable housing in line with SODC requirements to be included, if feasible. This helps to ensure a mix of unit sizes, in line with the Basic Conditions Statement.</p> <p>Density is based on SODC's Landscape Capacity Assessment</p>	<p>Para 6.5.2.1.2c.</p> <p>Para 6.5.2.2.2.</p> <p>Paras 6.5.3.1.1a and 6.5.4.1.1b.</p> <p>Para 6.6.2.2.2.</p> <p>Para 6.6.2.1.1b.</p> <p>Para 6.6.2.2.3e.</p>
--	---	--	---

	<p>In addition, your site allocation should resolve the issue of whether the economic use of the site is viable and whether the loss of employment opportunity is appropriate.</p> <p>Comments on <u>SA2 and SA3</u>: overtaken by SODC planning consents for these sites.</p> <p><u>CIL</u>:it would be helpful to have a section on infrastructure projects within the PNP. For example, (i) which infrastructure projects are considered essential (ii) a list of local infrastructure projects the parish would like to spend CIL money on.</p> <p>Issues to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· A list of projects or priorities for our parish?</li> <li>· Are the projects costed? Could they actually be delivered?</li> <li>· How will we decide what to spend CIL on?</li> <li>· How will we engage with the community on how to spend CIL?</li> <li>· Do we have effective administrative processes in place that will allow the district council to pass on CIL funds?</li> <li>· Do we have effective reporting mechanisms to show how we have spent CIL?</li> </ul> <p>Re the MOD site. When a site is redeveloped the floorspace of the existing building can be considered for the purpose of calculating CIL (i.e. when the building has been in use for the last 3 year the floorspace can be deducted from the proposed floorspace).</p> <p><u>Parish council actions:</u> 8.3.1 Work with developers It may be useful to create a protocol which could be included as an appendix.</p> <p>8.3.2. Nominate assets of community value By the time your plan is made, applications for the designation of Assets of Community Value would have been determined. It may be worth revising this section to state that the Parish Council will identify, nominate and re-nominate Assets of Community Value, if appropriate.</p> <p>8.3.4 Monitor housing needs It is not clear how this will be achieved. For example, is it going to be through a survey? How often would the survey be carried out, i.e. every five years? - Please clarify.</p> <p>8.3.5 Monitor the PNP It is not clear how the plan will be monitored, when it will be monitored and how the findings will be reported back to the community – please clarify.</p>	<p>Report, 2015, covering this site. This justifies a lower density than envisaged by CSH2.</p> <p>Covered by amendment to supporting text to <i>Policy SA1: former MoD site (PYR1)</i>, indicating that not viable as pure employment site.</p> <p>Policies SA2 and SA3 deleted.</p> <p>The PNP now contains a list of likely projects to be funded in whole or in part by CIL: see supporting text for policy <i>C2: Development contributions</i>.</p> <p>Supporting text for policy <i>C2: Development contributions</i> sets out procedures for dealing with CIL.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Done. PPC adopted a Pre-Application Community Involvement Protocol on 19 December 2017.</p> <p>Amendment made.</p> <p>Action deleted.</p> <p>Text amended. PPC to dedicate one meeting to formal review once a year. Community to be</p>	<p>Para 6.6.2.2.2.</p> <p>Paras 6.3.2.2.4 and 6.3.2.2.5.</p> <p>Paras 6.3.2.1.2. and 6.3.2.2.6.</p> <p>PNP supporting document: Pre-Application Community Involvement Protocol.</p> <p>Para 7.2.2.2.</p> <p>Para 7.2.6.</p>
--	---	--	---

	<p>8.3.6 Keep the PNP up to date: it is important to monitor it and review when necessary. Suggest replacing the suggestion that the plan will be reviewed in five years and every five years thereafter with an explanation that the plan will be monitored early (for example) and reviewed when necessary.</p>	<p>kept informed through website updates and the annual meeting of parish.</p> <p>Amended so that PPC commits to reviewing and updating the plan formally one year after it is made and then as necessary thereafter.</p>	<p>Para 7.2.7.</p>
<p>Oxfordshire County Council</p>	<p>One of the sites proposed as a Local Green Space (PYR2) is a site where there is proposed safeguarding for a road in the Local Plan Second Preferred Options (a bypass around Watlington). The draft PNP therefore appears inconsistent with the strategic policies of the emerging Local Plan. If the road is required to mitigate the effects of development, then the OCC would potentially object to a NP which did not recognise the safeguarding.</p> <p>It is possible that part of PYR2 could be needed for expansion of Icknield Community College. OCCI might therefore object to a NP which sought a Local Green Space designation over land potentially needed for school expansion.</p> <p>The Local Green Space for PYR2 also conflicts with a current planning application P16/S2576/O, for 100 residential dwellings, to which the OCCI lodged an objection in October 2016.</p> <p>It is the OCC's informal view that it would be preferable for the submission and examination of the PNP to await the outcome of the Local Plan, or for the proposal for Local Green Space (Policy BNE3) at PYR2 to be deleted, and the proposal for development at PYR1 reconsidered in relation to whether a road is necessary here.</p> <p>Some statements about the effect of the proposed road within the draft PNP are likely to be disputed by the OCC should they remain in a Submission document if the safeguarding for a road is being pursued in the Local Plan. For example, we would likely dispute that the proposed road would lead to more traffic within Pyrton Village itself. We would also dispute the statement in paragraph 9.4.8 that 'the proposal does not deliver any benefit with regard to resolving current traffic issues within Watlington town centre'.</p> <p>Although we acknowledge that the MOD site is brownfield land, from a sustainability point of</p>	<p>The local green space policy (BNE3) no longer applies to PYR2, which is instead covered by a 'local gap' policy (BNE4). That is not inconsistent with the safeguarding of a Watlington bypass route included in the emerging SODC Local Plan.</p> <p>Recognising this, the 'local gap' policy (BNE4) makes an exception for expansion of Icknield Community College.</p> <p>No action taken. The PPC remains opposed to this planning application. A residential development on PYR2 would be inconsistent with the 'local gap' policy (BNE4).</p> <p>Revision of the PNP took place after the issue of the Publication Version of the Local Plan in October 2017. The 'local green space' policy has been replaced by a more flexible 'local gap' policy (BNE4). SODC's safeguarded route does not affect PYR1 directly.</p> <p>The traffic policies and issues are not now covered in the PNP, on advice from SODC that these are not appropriate subject matter for a NP. Traffic is now covered by the parish council action plan set out in the PNP..</p> <p>The supporting text for <i>Policy SA1: Former MoD</i></p>	<p>Para 6.2.5.1.1.</p> <p>Para 6.2.5.1.5.</p> <p>Para 6.2.5.1.1.</p> <p>Para 7.2.5.</p> <p>Para 6.6.2.2.</p>

	<p>view, it is neither within Pyrton nor Watlington and therefore is not within easy walking distance of services and facilities. Residents may therefore feel isolated from both villages. Even with the alignment as proposed in the Local Plan Second Preferred Options it is also observed that some land from this site may be required to widen Pyrton Lane and/or improve the junction with the B4009.</p> <p>Comments on Policy TTI1: Access and Parking and Policy TTI2: Traffic Levels and Air Quality.</p> <p>Given the limited amount of development, the parish will receive limited CIL receipts, however it may be worthwhile including in the PNP a more formal list of likely projects than that included in para 7.4.5.2 (5), which simply records consultation to date.</p> <p>Key public health points below to be considered for inclusion in PNP: Promotion of active travel as the first-choice mode of transport for local journeys within Pyrton;</p> <p>Consideration as to how local facilities in neighbouring Watlington can be made more accessible for pedestrians and cyclists.</p> <p>Opportunities to make healthier food choices – although the draft NP does not currently detail any current food/allotment provision in Pyrton (except for reference to agricultural land) this could help to make the case for allotment and/or community food growing provision as part of any new development. This could also be linked to the priorities for potential CIL funding detailed in 7.4.5.2. [now Policy C1]]</p> <p>Increase opportunities for social interaction/reducing social isolation and loneliness – this could support making the case for multi-functional community facilities, in particular with expanding the uses of the current church and village hall buildings where appropriate, and also the green infrastructure and public realm. In addition to helping to maximise potential for physical integration between the existing residents of Pyrton and residents of new dwellings, creating spaces that bring people together can support mental wellbeing/community</p>	<p><i>site (PYR1)</i> notes that site benefits from pavement linkages to services and facilities in Watlington, in reasonable proximity to the site. It assesses that this is therefore a sustainable location, although any development is likely to lead to additional local traffic.</p> <p>Traffic policies TTI1 and TTI2 have been deleted on advice from SODC that traffic policies are inappropriate for a NP. Traffic is now included in the PPC action plan.</p> <p>The PNP now contains a list of likely projects to be funded in whole or in part by CIL: see supporting text for policy C2: <i>Development contributions</i>.</p> <p><i>Policy BNE6: Footpaths and bridleways</i> encourages active travel.</p> <p><i>Policy BNE4</i> covers replacement of the current footpath on PYR2 by another safe route. Supporting text to <i>Policy BNE6: Footpaths and bridleways</i> explains importance of provision of safe pedestrian and cycle routes to neighbouring settlements.</p> <p>PNP includes mention of the market garden in Pyrton, which sells fruit and vegetables. There is no requirement or demand for allotments in Pyrton. <i>Policy BNE4: Local Gap</i> covering PYR2 caters for the establishment of allotments on PYR2.</p> <p>Noted for future parish council action, in coordination with separate independent village organisations responsible for the church and village hall. One of CIL projects is recreational facilities on charity land on Pyrton Lane.</p>	<p>Para 7.2.5.</p> <p>Para 6.2.7.1</p> <p>Para 6.2.6.3.2.</p> <p>Para 6.2.5.1.5.</p> <p>Para 6.2.6.4.2.</p> <p>Para 4.5.1.</p> <p>Para 6.2.5.1.3.</p> <p>Para 6.3.2.2.5.</p>
--	--	--	--

	<p>spirit. Creating an environment that allows people to be more active will also protect and enhance mental health and wellbeing. We would encourage appropriate green space identification to contribute towards this.</p> <p>Consideration should be made for making the case for new builds that meet 'lifetime homes' standards to potentially enable existing and new residents who would benefit from this type of housing provision to be able to stay in the area for longer.</p> <p>Consideration could be given to introducing regularly spaced benches within public areas and the replacement of any footpath stiles with accessible gates to increase accessibility and encourage use by a broader section of the community.</p> <p>We welcome the attention given to the landscape and setting of the AONB and the importance of protecting this in future. Reference could usefully be made to the Oxfordshire Wildlife and Landscape Study <a href="http://owls.oxfordshire.gov.uk">http://owls.oxfordshire.gov.uk</a>, to provide further guidance on landscape context. Reference could usefully be made to the emerging Green Infrastructure Strategy of South Oxfordshire District Council</p> <p>It would be helpful to include mention of the Chilterns Escarpment North Conservation Target Area (CTA). CTAs are key areas of opportunity for the enhancement of wildlife, identified at a county scale.</p> <p>The CPRE has recently published new satellite data on light pollution that may help to inform local planning decisions, including small scale lighting improvement projects.</p> <p>As a general principle we would encourage communities to seek a net gain in biodiversity where permission for new development is being sought, to be informed by appropriate ecological surveys.</p>	<p>Proposal for new developments to include communal area or new public green spaces, as part of <i>Policy D1: Detailed design criteria</i>.</p> <p>Reflected in amenity uses envisaged for charity land on Pyrton Lane.</p> <p>Included in <i>Policy D1: Detailed design criteria</i>.</p> <p>Included in <i>Policy BNE6: Footpaths and bridleways</i>.</p> <p>Reference included.</p> <p>Mentioned in PNP, and supporting Landscape and Green Space Study.</p> <p>References included in PNP.</p> <p>Net gain in biodiversity and long-term management of biodiversity sought in policies <i>BNE2: Landscape Character</i> and <i>SA1: Former MoD site (PYR1)</i>.</p>	<p>Para 6.5.2.1.2c</p> <p>Paras 6.2.4.2.1. and 6.3.3.2.2.5c.</p> <p>Para 6.5.2.1.2e.</p> <p>Para 6.2.6.3.1</p> <p>Para 4.8.2.3.</p> <p>PNP supporting document <i>Landscape and Green Space Study</i>, Section 4.4, pp.13-8</p> <p>Paras 4.8.2.3 and 6.2.3.2.4 of PNP.</p> <p>PNP supporting documents <i>Landscape and Green Space Study</i>, para 4.3 (3) &amp; <i>Draft Conservation Area Appraisal</i>, pp.21-2</p> <p>Para 4.8.2.5. of PNP.</p> <p>Paras 6.2.3.1.6 and 6.6.2.1.d.v.</p>
--	--	--	--

Carter Jonas on behalf of the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA)	Writing to support the general provisions of the emerging PNP and note the comments raised regarding the redevelopment of Chalgrove Airfield.	None	
Thames Water	<p>Expresses support for Policy BNE4: <i>Flood Risk and Drainage</i> [now BNE5] and its supporting text in paragraph 7.3.6.2.</p> <p>Site SA1: Former MoD site is likely to cause capacity concerns. As such discussions with the developer will be required in order to determine the ability of the existing network to accommodate the proposed development.</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>Noted. Provision of sufficient capacity is required under <i>Policy BNE5: Flood risk and drainage</i>.</p>	Para 6.2.6.1.2.
English Heritage	<p>Expresses support for references to the history of Pyrton (paras 4.11 &amp; 4.21) and is pleased to note that heritage is greatly valued by residents. Welcomes historic context provided by sub section 4.3.</p> <p>Suggests adding more about the conservation area.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>The Parish Council has been working with SODC to prepare a Conservation Area appraisal for Pyrton in order to inform planning application proposals and decisions. The purpose of this was to define the special interest of the Conservation Area, including proposals for extending its boundaries to include the south-eastern approach to the village and the full extent of Pyrton Manor grounds. It explains the significance of the area and seeks to ensure its special interest and character is preserved and enhanced. An appreciation of this is essential in managing change within the Conservation Area and its wider setting. The draft appraisal,</p>	Para 6.2.2.2 (3) PNP Supporting Document <i>Draft Conservation Area Appraisal</i>

	<p>Welcomes identification of the designated heritage assets, but would welcome further reference to the archaeological interest of the parish (eg. further information regarding Golder, Clare and Standhill).</p> <p>National Planning Practise Guidance is quoted '<i>Neighbourhood Plans need to include enough information about local non-designated heritage assets including sites of archaeological interest to guide decisions</i>' and it is suggested that non designated heritage assets, such as locally important buildings, might form an important part of the evidence base for the plan.</p> <p>It is suggested that the evidence base for the plan should also include a character assessment of the parish and some sort of design advice eg. a Village Design Statement.</p>	<p>submitted to SODC in October 2017, is part of the evidence base for the PNP and is included as a supporting document. It sets out the heritage features within the parish that fall within the established Conservation Area, along with further areas of merit and non-designated heritage assets that have been identified.</p> <p>Further information on the archaeological interest of Golder, Clare and Standhill is now provided as part of the section on historical context within the PNP.</p> <p>Other areas of archaeological interest within the Conservation Area and also within the proposed extension to the Conservation Area are discussed in Pyrton's <i>Draft Conservation Area Appraisal</i></p> <p>A section on locally important buildings that are not listed but make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of Pyrton's Conservation Area are discussed in the <i>Draft Conservation Area Appraisal</i>.</p> <p>Pyrton's <i>Draft Conservation Area Appraisal</i> presents a case for extending the Conservation area boundaries to include a significant area of readily identifiable heritage value.</p> <p><i>Policy BNE1 (Historic Environment)</i> now refers to the non-designated (and designated) heritage assets that contribute to the character of the parish and should be conserved and enhanced.</p> <p>Pyrton's <i>Draft Conservation Area Appraisal</i> includes a character assessment of the village of Pyrton and the <i>Landscape and Green Space Study</i> (also</p>	<p>Para 4.3 (15)</p> <p>PNP Supporting Document <i>Draft Conservation Area Appraisal</i>, Section 1 'Evidential Value', p.2; Section 4 'Archaeology', p.15</p> <p>PNP Supporting Document <i>Draft Conservation Area Appraisal</i>, Section 6.4, p.29</p> <p>PNP Supporting Document <i>Draft Conservation Area Appraisal</i> (in particular, section 7 'Boundary Changes', p.33)</p> <p>Para 6.2.2.</p> <p>PNP Supporting Documents <i>Draft Conservation Area Appraisal</i> (in particular, section 6 'Character Analysis,' p.23-27)</p>
--	--	---	--

	<p>It is suggested the condition of heritage assets should be considered, particularly within the Conservation Area. It is suggested the vision of the PNP could be clarified and a direct reference to the conservation and enhancement of heritage features is encouraged. The Aims (a &amp; d) and Objectives a (i &amp; iii) and d of the PNP are welcomed.</p> <p>Policy BNE1 on Landscape Character is welcomed although a reference in the supporting text to the Oxfordshire Landscape Character Assessment is suggested.</p> <p>Policy BNE2 is welcomed in principle although it adds little to the South Oxfordshire Local Plan Policy and needs to be more specific on a neighbourhood scale. The policy should also cover non heritage assets.</p> <p>Welcomes Policy BNE3 on local green spaces, particularly the protection afforded to Area C for its contribution to the conservation area and setting of Shirburn Registered Park. Are there other green spaces that perform similar functions or are historic in their own right?</p>	<p>included as a supporting document for the PNP) provides a detailed assessment of the open countryside that characterises the majority of the parish.</p> <p><i>Policy D1 Detailed Design Criteria</i> has been revised to reflect the character of the parish, as evidenced in Pyrton's <i>Draft Conservation Area Appraisal and Landscape and Green Space Study</i></p> <p>The <i>Draft Conservation Area Appraisal</i> considers the issues and opportunities for the preservation and enhancement of heritage assets.</p> <p><i>Policy BNE1 (Historic Environment)</i> has been rewritten and additional information added to the supporting text to clarify the vision of the PNP in conserving and enhancing heritage features.</p> <p>The Aims of the PNP now reflect a clearer vision</p> <p>Please note that <i>Policy BNE1 (Landscape Character)</i> is now <i>Policy BNE2</i>. Reference made in supporting text.</p> <p>Please note that <i>Policy BNE2 (Historic Environment)</i> is now <i>Policy BNE1</i>. This policy is now supported by Pyrton's <i>Draft Conservation Area Appraisal</i> and covers non-heritage assets.</p> <p>Comments on <i>Policy BNE3</i> noted and other green spaces that are historic in their own right are discussed in Pyrton's <i>Draft Conservation Area Appraisal</i> and have become part of the rationale for extending Pyrton's Conservation Area boundary</p>	<p>&amp; <i>Landscape and Green Space Study</i> (in particular, Section 4 'Regional Landscape Character Context', pp.8-18 &amp; Section 5 'Pyrton Landscape Types,' pp.21-31).</p> <p>Para 6.5.2</p> <p>PNP Supporting Document <i>Draft Conservation Area Appraisal</i>, Section 6.7 'Issues and Opportunities for Preservation and Enhancement,' p.31-32</p> <p>Para 6.2.2</p> <p>Para 5.4</p> <p>Para 6.2.3.2 (2)</p> <p>Para 6.2.2</p> <p>PNP Supporting Document <i>Draft Conservation Area Appraisal</i> (particularly Section 5.4 'Trees and Green Landscape,' p.19-21 &amp; Section 7 'Boundary Changes,' p.33).</p>
--	---	--	--

	<p>Policy D1 and D2 are welcomed in principle, but it is suggested that they are more detailed to ensure good design in developments throughout the plan area (see NPPF para 58). It is important that there is a characterisation/design study to underpin this policy.</p> <p>Welcomes Policy D3, particularly clause e.</p> <p>Site Allocations: According to their records there are no designated heritage assets on or near Site A. Site B is adjacent to the Grade II Registered Historic Park and Garden of Shirburn Castle and Site C is adjacent to the Conservation Area. They do not consider the one or two well designed houses proposed for Site B would be likely to have a detrimental impact on the significance of Shirburn Castle and therefore have no objection.</p> <p>Welcomes requirement in Policy SA3 that 'the owner or developer submits a proportionate design and access statement to explain why the proposed scheme is acceptable and in keeping with the nearby conservation area', but would prefer a more direct requirement that the scheme enhances the setting of the conservation area.</p> <p>The Historic Environment Record should be consulted for any records of archaeological finds the proposed sites.</p> <p>Welcomes the proposed action to review the extent of the conservation area. Other actions could include the preparation of a comprehensive list of locally important buildings and features or a survey of Grade II buildings to ascertain their condition.</p>	<p><i>Policy D1</i>: Detailed design criteria text made more specific: viz. designs that are generally influenced by the Chiltern vernacular architectural style featuring brick, flint and tiles, and local conditions. Supporting text refers to Chilterns Building Design Guide, 2010.</p> <p>Policies D1 &amp; D2 supported by information provided by Pyrton's <i>Draft Conservation Area Appraisal</i> and <i>Landscape and Green Space Study</i></p> <p>Noted</p> <p>The two sites previously identified as B (Land Between Old Vicarage Cottage and The Lodge House) and C (Land at New Farm) are now covered by planning consents and therefore no longer included in the PNP. Comment on Site A (Former MoD site) has been noted.</p> <p><i>Policy SA3 (Land at New Farm)</i> deleted as this site is now covered by planning consent.</p> <p>The HER shows no records of archaeological finds on Site A (Former MoD site)</p> <p>Action taken to review the extent of the conservation area and prepare a comprehensive list of locally important buildings and features - see Pyrton's <i>Draft Conservation Area Appraisal</i> submitted to SODC in October 2017 and included as a</p>	<p>Para 6.5.2.1 (2c).</p> <p>Para 6.5.2.2 (2).</p> <p>PNP Supporting Documents <i>Draft Conservation Area Appraisal</i> (in particular, section 6 'Character Analysis,' pp.23-7) &amp; <i>Landscape and Green Space Study</i> (in particular, Section 4 'Regional Landscape Character Context', p.8-18 &amp; Section 5 'Pyrton Landscape Types,' pp.21-31).</p>
--	---	---	---

		<p>supporting document for the PNP. Future action to survey Grade II buildings to ascertain their condition noted.</p>	
<p>Natural England</p>	<p>Expressed support for Policy 'BNE1 Landscape Character'</p> <p>Advises that Policy SA1 emphasises the need for a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) to be submitted with applications and also the need for applications to take into account the recommendations of the SODC Landscape Capacity Study. Advises that the PNP take advice from the Chilterns Conservation Board; their knowledge of the site and its wider landscape setting, together with the aims and objectives of the AONB's statutory management plan.</p> <p>Advises that the other allocated sites within the PNP which also sit within the setting of the AONB should be subject to LVIA.</p> <p>Recommends that a policy regarding conservation and enhancement of biodiversity is added within the built and natural environment policies, seeking a net gain in biodiversity in line with para 109 of the NPPF.</p>	<p>Policy <i>BNE1</i> has now become Policy <i>BNE2</i>.</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Natural England's advice regarding the AONB prompted a <i>Landscape and Green Space Study of Pyrton Parish</i>. This is now included as one of the PNP supporting documents.</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Done</p> <p>To help ensure the survival of threatened and protected local wildlife the importance of maintaining dark night skies within the parish has been emphasised in policy <i>D1 'Detailed Design Criteria'</i>.</p> <p><i>Pyrton's Draft Conservation Area Appraisal</i>, included as a supporting document for the PNP, provides information on biodiversity within the Conservation Area.</p> <p><i>Pyrton's Landscape and Green Space Study</i>, also included as a supporting document for the PNP, discusses conservation and enhancement of biodiversity within the parish.</p>	<p>Para 6.2.3.</p> <p>Para 6.6.2.1 (e)</p> <p>PNP Supporting Document <i>Landscape and Green Space Study</i> (section 4.3) discusses 'The Chilterns AONB Character Assessment and Management Plan.' Further discussion of the AONB is provided by section 5.2.</p> <p>Para 6.2.3.1 (2)</p> <p>Paras 6.2.3.1 (6) &amp; 6.2.3.2 (4).</p> <p>Para 6.5.2.1 (f).</p> <p>PNP Supporting Document <i>Draft Conservation Area Appraisal</i>, para 5.4.</p> <p>PNP Supporting Document <i>Landscape and Green Space Study</i>, sections 4 &amp; 7.</p>

	<p>Points out that part of the PNP area is within the 'Chilterns Escarpment North' Conservation Target Area and that biodiversity enhancements should be designed where possible to help achieve the aims of this CTA.</p>	<p>Pyrton's CTA is now discussed within the supporting text of <i>Policy BNE2</i> and also within the PNP's supporting documents <i>Draft Conservation Area Appraisal</i> and <i>Landscape and Green Space Study</i>.</p>	<p>Para 6.2.3.2 (4) PNP Supporting Documents <i>Landscape and Green Space Study</i>, para 4.3 (3) &amp; <i>Draft Conservation Area Appraisal</i>, para 5.4.</p>
<p>Environment Agency</p>	<p>Based on the environmental constraints within the area, no detailed comments to make in relation to the PNP.</p> <p>Pleased to see that proposed housing allocation site (PYR1) has been directed to an area at the lowest probability of flooding and is located within Flood Zone 1.</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>None.</p>	
<p>Providence Land Ltd</p>	<p>The PNP fails to recognise the need for sites PYR1 and PYR2 to accommodate a bypass/alternative traffic route for the Plan, as identified in the recent SODC Local Plan Second Preferred Options consultation and also in the recent Watlington Neighbourhood Plan consultation.</p> <p>The PNP fails to allocate site PYR2 for housing development on the mistaken assumption that it does not relate to the town of Watlington, despite it directly adjoining the Watlington settlement boundary.</p> <p>The PNP wrongly seeks to designate PYR2 as a Local Green Space despite it clearly not meeting the national criteria for such a designation.</p>	<p>The safeguarding of the bypass by SODC does not yet amount to a proposal or a policy. The PNP notes the safeguarding. Its local gap' policy for PYR2 (<i>BNE4: Local Gap</i>) is not inconsistent with that safeguarding. SODC's safeguarded route does not affect PYR1 directly.</p> <p>None. The PNP designates PYR2 as a 'local gap', designed to prevent the coalescence of Pyrton and Watlington. The PPC remains opposed to Providence Land's application P16/S2576/O, for 100 residential dwellings.</p> <p>The PNP has changed the designation of PYR2 to that of a 'local gap' (<i>Policy BNE4</i>).</p>	<p>Para 6.2.5.1.</p> <p>Para 6.2.5.1.</p> <p>Para 6.2.5.1.</p>

Watlington Parish Council	Supports the main proposals in the PNP including the designation of PYR2 as a Local Green Space, but insists that a re-routed B4009 crossing PYR2 is required.	The PNP has changed the designation of PYR2 to that of a 'local gap', which does not preclude a bypass crossing it.	Para 6.2.5.1.
Watlington Parish Council	The possible use of PYR1 for a care home and associated 'close care' or 'extra care' provision should be included as one option	The PNP now states that a change of use to residential or mixed residential/employment represents a positive planning response to an underused site, and records an application lodged on 2 January 2018 for 37 assisted living units, a care home and 4 staff accommodation units to be built on the site.	Para 6.6.2.2.
Watlington Parish Council	The PNP makes no mention of meetings between representatives of Pyrton Parish Council and Watlington NDP Forum, and teams from both parishes with SODC and HCA, attempting to resolve the conflicting aims of the two draft NDPs	These meetings are acknowledged in Pyrton Parish Council's letter of response to Watlington PC and details of dates are included in the text of their comments above	